

LXX ISAIAH 24:1–26:6  
AS INTERPRETATION AND TRANSLATION



# Society of Biblical Literature



Septuagint and Cognate Studies

Wolfgang Kraus, Editor

Robert J. V. Hiebert

Karen Jobes

Arie van der Kooij

Siegfried Kreuzer

Philippe Le Moigne

Number 62

LXX ISAIAH 24:1–26:6  
AS INTERPRETATION AND TRANSLATION  
A METHODOLOGICAL DISCUSSION

*By*  
Wilson de Angelo Cunha

SBL Press  
Atlanta

Copyright © 2014 by SBL Press

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, SBL Press, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329 USA.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Cunha, Wilson de Angelo, author.

LXX Isaiah 24:1–26:6 as interpretation and translation : a methodological discussion / by Wilson de Angelo Cunha.

p. cm. — (Septuagint and cognate studies ; number 62)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-62837-022-5 (paper binding : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-62837-023-2 (electronic format) — ISBN 978-1-62837-024-9 (hardcover binding : alk. paper)

1. Bible. Isaiah, XXIV-XXVI, 6—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 2. Bible. Old Testament. Greek—Versions—Septuagint. I. Title. II. Series: Septuagint and cognate studies series ; no. 62.

BS1515.52.C86 2014

224'.10486—dc23

2014027665

Printed on acid-free, recycled paper conforming to  
ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) and ISO 9706:1994  
standards for paper permanence.



To Katie



## CONTENTS

Preface.....	ix
Abbreviations .....	xiii

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. The Contours of LXX Isaiah's Research History	1
1.2. Preliminary Questions	32
1.3. Problematic Assumptions	36
1.4. Methodology	43
1.5. Contribution	45
1.6. Scope	46

### PART 1: MT AND LXX ISAIAH COMPARED

2. Isaiah 24:1-23: A Comparison.....	51
3. Isaiah 25:1-12: A Comparison.....	85
4. Isaiah 26:1-6: A Comparison .....	107

### PART 2: LXX ISAIAH IN ITS OWN RIGHT

5. LXX Isaiah 24 in Its Own Right .....	121
5.1. Isaiah 24:1-3: Translation and Commentary	121
5.2. Isaiah 24:4-7: Translation and Commentary	127
5.3. Isaiah 24:8-12: Translation and Commentary	132
5.4. Isaiah 24:13: Translation and Commentary	138
5.5. Isaiah 24:14-16: Translation and Commentary	140
5.6. Isaiah 24:17-20: Translation and Commentary	149
5.7. Isaiah 24:21-23: Translation and Commentary	152
5.8. Summary	155

6. LXX Isaiah 25 in Its Own Right .....	157
6.1. Isaiah 25:1–5: Translation and Commentary .....	157
6.2. Isaiah 25:6–12: Translation and Commentary .....	170
6.3. Summary .....	179
7. LXX Isaiah 26:1–6 in Its Own Right .....	181
7.1. Isaiah 26:1–3b: Translation and Commentary .....	181
7.2. Isaiah 26:3c–6: Translation and Commentary .....	184
7.3. Summary .....	187
8. Conclusions.....	189
8.1. A Word on Methodology .....	192
8.2. Further Research .....	193
Bibliography .....	197
Index of Ancient Sources.....	207
Index of Modern Authors.....	222



## PREFACE

The present monograph is a revised version of my PhD dissertation submitted to Universiteit Leiden in September 2011. The present work tackles the difficult issue of explaining divergences found in LXX Isaiah vis-à-vis the MT, arguing that differences found in the Greek must be weighed against the literary context in which they are found. Do they cohere with the so-called “literal translations” taken from the translator’s or scribe’s *Vorlage*? If so, what is the ideological message of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 and how does it compare to modern interpretations of MT Isa 24:1–26:6? In general, this work attempts to demonstrate that LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 can be seen as a coherent ideological composition which differs greatly from the way scholars have interpreted MT Isa 24:1–26:6. This coherence comes across through the use of certain lexemes and conjunctions throughout the corpus under discussion. The main conclusion this work draws from the level of coherence found in LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 is that its scribe or translator already had an interpretation—on a higher level—before he started the process of translation. That is, the interpretation of his Hebrew *Vorlage* preceded and, to a large extent, shaped his translation into Greek.

Some will object to attempts at uncovering the translator’s ideology: how can the translator’s ideology be discovered when he is simply conveying what is in his *Vorlage*? However, while it is true that the translator was trying to relay what he found in his *Vorlage*, it is also true that he tried to communicate what was there *according to his interpretation of it*. In the case of Isa 24:1–26:6, the translator’s interpretation differs significantly from modern scholars’ interpretation of the same corpus. Indeed, it would be a grave mistake to expect the translator to interpret his *Vorlage* the same way we do today.

Briefly, two interrelated themes come to the fore in LXX Isa 24:1–26:6. The first focuses on “cities” (see Isa 24:10, 12; 25:2–4; 26:1, 5). The use of πόλις and πόλις ὀχυρά lends coherence to LXX Isa 24:1–26:6. It emphasizes the destruction of the city(ies) of the ungodly and salvation for the oppressed. The second theme centers on judgment and salvation. While there is judgment for the “ungodly” and their cities, there is salvation for the oppressed and their cities. In connection with the themes of “cities” and “judgment and

salvation” is an emphasis on a few different groups: the “ungodly,” the “poor,” the “remnant,” a “righteous people,” and the “we group” of Isa 25:5. More research on these groups in the historical and social context of the translation will need to be conducted at a future opportunity. For now, it suffices to say that the translator interpreted his *Vorlage* as announcing judgment on the “ungodly,” and salvation or liberation for all the other groups, with salvation having different nuances depending on the group in question (see §8 in the present study).

The book starts with an introductory chapter that briefly sketches the main lines of development of research on LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 in order to clearly track shifts in perspective without being exhaustive. The introduction also discusses issues of methodology, contribution, and scope. The work is then divided into two main parts. Part 1 deals with Isa 24:1–23; 25:1–12; 26:1–6 respectively in three main chapters. The focus is on comparing MT with LXX in order to highlight differences in the Greek. Part 2 then analyzes Isa 24:1–23; 25:1–12; 26:1–6 respectively in three main chapters. The focus in these chapters is on analyzing the Greek in its own right in an attempt to ascertain whether the Greek text has a coherence of its own. A concluding chapter summarizes the main themes of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6, discusses the proper methodological approach to LXX Isaiah, and points to future lines of research.

Many thanks are due to numerous people who directly or indirectly contributed to the production of this book. I would like to mention here first my supervisor, Prof. dr. Arie van der Kooij. I would not have been able to complete this project without his superb guidance, dedication, patience, and encouragement. I will never forget meeting him almost every two weeks to discuss the progress of the present research during my four years in Leiden. In those meetings, I not only benefited from Prof. Arie’s vast expertise in LXX and Hebrew Bible studies, but also from his patience with my progress and encouragement when it was needed. I will probably never forget the multifaceted learning experience I received in those meetings.

I would also like to thank the members of my dissertation committee who read the present work carefully and made valuable suggestions. Prof. dr. Florian Wilk (Georg-August-Universität Göttingen) must be thanked for his key methodological suggestions, among other things. Prof. dr. Muraoka (Universiteit Leiden) noted many details both in my reading of the Greek and the Hebrew. Michaël N. van der Meer (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen) also called my attention to several details and to other methodological issues. Prof. dr. R. B. ter Haar Romeny (Universiteit Leiden) must also be thanked for insightful questions during the defense. Members of the opposition committee must also be remembered for their helpful suggestions. Worth noting here is Prof.

dr. Wido van Peursen, now at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, who sent me his valuable notes. I would like to mention my colleague Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, who asked helpful questions during the defense. Needless to say, the manuscript as it now stands is my sole responsibility.

Prof. Philippe Le Moigne at Université Paul-Valéry kindly made available to me the manuscript of his French translation of LXX Isaiah for the project *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. It was very helpful to compare his translation with other translations available during my research.

Others indirectly made this project possible. I am greatly indebted to Carl J. Bosma, Old Testament professor at Calvin Theological Seminary, who secured the necessary funding for my initial PhD studies in the Netherlands. I would later find out that Prof. John Stek, then emeritus Old Testament professor at the same institution, had generously provided that funding. Unfortunately, Prof. Stek passed away before I could thank him for his support. Mention needs to be made of friends of the International Reformed Evangelical Fellowship in Delft and of St. James Anglican Church in Voorschoten, who offered their friendship and support during my family's time in Holland. I should also thank Mrs. Karen Harris from the Evangelical Presbyterian Church of Longview, Texas, for proofreading this manuscript and improving its English. Whatever problems that may remain are my full responsibility.

I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Kraus for accepting my manuscript for publication in this prestigious series. Thanks are also due to Leigh C. Andersen at SBL Press and her editorial group for their careful work of typesetting, including their suggestions at critical points. In this case also, I am responsible for the final form of this document.

Finally, I dedicate this book to my wife Katie, who followed and faithfully walked by my side in a distant and strange land to both of us, but to a land that has had a tremendous positive impact in our lives. My studies could not have been completed without her friendship, support, motivation, and love.

Wilson de Angelo Cunha  
December 2013  
Longview, Texas



## ABBREVIATIONS

### PRIMARY SOURCES

26	Rome, tenth century CE
α'	Aquila
εβρ'	ὁ Ἑβραῖος, τὸ Ἑβραϊκόν
θ'	Theodotion
σ'	Symmachus
A	Alexandrinus
A'	Alexandrinus Group
<i>Agr.</i>	Philo, <i>De agricultura</i>
<i>Ant.</i>	Josephus, <i>Jewish Antiquities</i>
B	Codex Vaticanus
<i>BHK</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica</i> , ed. R. Kittel
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
Heb.	Hebrew
L	Lucianic Recension
LXX	Septuagint
<i>Migr.</i>	Philo, <i>De migrationi Abrahami</i>
MT	Masoretic Text
P. Tebt.	Tebtunis papyri
Pesh.	Peshitta
Q <sup>mg</sup>	Marchalianus <sup>margin</sup>
Q <sup>txt</sup>	Marchalianus <sup>text</sup>
S	Sinaiticus
<i>Somn.</i>	Philo, <i>De somniis</i>
<i>Spec.</i>	Philo, <i>De specialibus legibus</i>
Targ.	Targum
Vulg.	Vulgate

## SECONDARY SOURCES

AB	Anchor Bible
ALR	Ancient Languages Resources
ArBib	The Aramaic Bible
ATA	Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen
BDB	Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford: Clarendon, 1907.
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BIOSCS	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament. Edited by Martin Noth and H. W. Wolff
Brenton	Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton, <i>The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament: with an English Translation and with Various Readings and Critical Notes</i> . London: Bagster & Sons, 1870.
BTL	Benjamins Translation Library
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CTAT	Dominique Barthélemy, <i>Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament</i> . 4 vols. OBO 50. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982–2005.
<i>Did</i>	<i>Didaskalia</i>
DSSR	Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader</i> . 6 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2004–2005.
<i>EstFr</i>	<i>Estudios Franciscanos</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GELS	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . Takamitsu Muraoka. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
GKC	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
HALOT	Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm, <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000.

HRCS	Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, <i>Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament</i> . 2 vols. Oxford, 1897. Suppl., 1906. Repr., 3 vols. in 2, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983.
HUB	Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, ed., <i>The Book of Isaiah</i> . The Hebrew University Bible. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995.
IBHS	Bruce K. Waltke and Michael O'Connor, <i>An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax</i> . Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>Itin</i>	<i>Itinerarium</i> (Portugal)
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JEOL</i>	<i>Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Gezelschap (Genootschap) Ex oriente lux</i>
Joüon	Paul Joüon, <i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew</i> . 2nd reprint of 2nd ed. Translated and revised by Takamitsu Muraoka. SubBi 27. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2009.
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LEH	Johan Lust, Eric Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . 2nd rev. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.
LSJ	Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
LXX.D.	<i>Septuaginta Deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung</i> . Edited by Eberhard Bons, Wolfgang Kraus, and Martin Karrer. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009.
MM	James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, <i>The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament</i> . London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1949.
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
MVEOL	<i>Mededelingen en verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux"</i>
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NAWG	Nachrichten (von) der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen
NETS	<i>A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title</i> .

	Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIV	New International Version
NJPS	<i>Tanakh: The Holy Scriptures: The New JPS Translation according to the Traditional Hebrew Text</i>
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OTL	Old Testament Library
OtSt	Oudtestamentische Studiën
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RCT	<i>Revista catalana de teologia</i>
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SubBi	Subsidia biblica
Text	<i>Textus: Studies of the Hebrew University Bible Project</i>
TLNT	<i>Theological Lexicon of the New Testament</i> . Ceslas Spicq. Translated and edited by James D. Ernest; 3 vols; Peabody, Mass., 1994.
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
VWGTh	Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

## OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

acc.	accusative
act.	active
ch.	chapter
dat.	dative
emph.	emphatic
fem.	feminine
fut.	future
imper	impersonal



impv.	imperative
inf.	infinitive
masc.	masculine
MS	manuscript
nom.	nominative
pass.	passive
pers.	person
pl.	plural
prep.	preposition
ptc.	participle
sing.	singular
subj.	subject
voc.	vocative



## INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the history of research on LXX Isaiah and discusses the research questions, methodology, contribution, and scope of the present work. The review of monographs and works dealing specifically with LXX Isaiah will inform the reader of its main research developments since its inception to the present time. It also offers a good background to the research questions that will occupy the present inquiry.

Early on (ca. 1880), research on LXX Isaiah focused mostly on its *Vorlage* and assumed that a very different Hebrew text from MT once lay behind the Greek. After almost a decade, scholars started to show a more cautious approach to the text-critical use of LXX Isaiah, calling attention to the personality of the translator. Since then this phrase has acquired two main emphases. In its initial stage, the “personality of the translator” referred to translation style, which was seen as rather free. In a later period, the same expression would denote not only translation style but also the translator’s theology. What follows below reviews in greater detail the shift from a focus on LXX Isaiah’s text-critical value to its author’s ideology.

Following the review of the research history, this chapter turns to the research questions and methodology that will be the main focus of the study. Justification as to why LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 was chosen as the corpus to illustrate a methodological discussion of LXX Isaiah will then bring this chapter’s discussion to an end.

### 1.1. THE CONTOURS OF LXX ISAIAH’S RESEARCH HISTORY

#### 1.1.1. LXX Isaiah and Its *Vorlage*

The very first monograph on LXX Isaiah was Anton Scholz’s *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias*.<sup>1</sup> In this work, Scholz strongly

---

1. (Würzburg: Woerl, 1880).

argued that the translator's *Vorlage* was in fact different from the Hebrew text preserved in MT. It was full of errors because of the way it was produced, namely, through dictation. Scholz postulated that while one person read the Hebrew aloud, another wrote it down. An unclear diction led the recorder to insert Hebrew words with similar sounds onto his copied text. For Scholz, this model of production accounted for what he viewed as several errors in LXX Isaiah. Conversely, the translator was not responsible for those errors as he worked with great care and could not have possibly made so many mistakes. Consequently, Scholz viewed an unclear diction, due to similarities between certain Hebrew consonants, as the main cause for the errors found in the Greek translation.<sup>2</sup>

To give a few examples from LXX Isa 24:1–26:6, Scholz claimed that ἡσχύνθησαν “they were ashamed” (Isa 24:9) for MT’s בִּשְׂרִיר “with the song” reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* that mistakenly read יִבְשׁוּ “they were ashamed.” The similarity of sounds between יִבְשׁוּ/בִּשְׂרִיר produced the reading יִבְשׁוּ in the translator's *Vorlage*, who then rendered it with ἡσχύνθησαν. Scholz also claimed that certain Hebrew consonants of similar shapes, such as *rêš* and *dālet*, *wāw* and *yôd*, caused some mistakes. For instance, πτωχός “poor” in Isa 25:3 is in place of MT’s עֹז “strong.” For Scholz, the translator's *Vorlage* read עָנִי “poor,” which was an error that resulted from the similarities of the consonants *zayin* and *nûn*.<sup>3</sup> In no way did Scholz consider that the translator himself may have been responsible for those differences. Instead, they were already in the translator's *Vorlage*, which for him varied from MT.

Scholz's different *Vorlage* hypothesis did not receive wide acceptance and was rejected in the early stages of LXX Isaiah's research.<sup>4</sup> Beginning with Ernst Liebmann, the focus shifted from the text behind the Greek to the translator in front of his *Vorlage*. The following questions became important: First, what was the style of the translation? Second, what was the level of the translator's knowledge of the Hebrew language? And, third, did the translator leave traces of his ideology in his translation?

2. Ibid., 15–16.

3. Ibid., 29, 30.

4. In a few cases, however, a few scholars continued to use the hypothesis of a different *Vorlage* to account for some of LXX Isaiah's departure from the Hebrew. See e.g., H. W. Sheppard, “ΤΟΥ ΣΙΛΩΑΜ - הַשִּׁלֹּחַ Isa. viii 6,” *JTS* 16 (1915): 414–16; Alberto Vaccari, “ΠΟΛΙΣ ΑΣΕΔΕΚ IS. 19, 18,” *Bib* 2 (1921), 353–56; Peter Katz, “Notes on the Septuagint,” *JTS* 47 (1946), 30–33; Alberto Vaccari, “Parole Rovesciate e Critiche Errate nella Bibbia Ebraica” in *Studi Orientalistici in Onore di Giorgio Levi Della Vida* (Pubblicazioni Dell'Istituto Per L'Oriente 54; Roma: Istituto Per L'Oriente, 1956), 2:553–66; the critical apparatus of *BHS*.

## 1.1.2. LXX Isaiah and the Personality of the Translator: Translation Style

In 1902, Liebmann began a series of articles devoted to a text-critical discussion of MT Isa 24–27 by comparing it with its ancient witnesses. His main contribution was his plea that the “personality of the translator(s)” should be taken into account before using their translation(s) for text-critical purposes. By this, he meant that a careful study of each translation’s style must precede any proposals for a different Hebrew *Vorlage* behind them.<sup>5</sup>

Focusing mainly on LXX Isaiah, Liebmann was interested in the following three questions: First, how well did the translator know the Hebrew language? Second, what was the style of his translation? Third, does the translator betray an influence from his worldview?<sup>6</sup> As for the translator’s familiarity with Hebrew, Liebmann concluded that the translator’s lexical and grammatical knowledge was good. Although the translator had some difficulties with the tenses of some Hebrew verbs, his familiarity with the Hebrew language was still commendable.<sup>7</sup>

As for the translation style, Liebmann paid attention to “additions” and “omissions,” sentence composition, differences in the number of verbal forms, the conjunction *καί*, the definite article, pronominal suffixes, and the use of prepositions. He concluded that LXX Isaiah does not carry any weight for textual criticism concerning sentence composition, the differences in the number of verbal forms, and additions. Contrarily, LXX Isaiah may have some text-critical value in its use of certain Greek words, certain uses of *καί*, the definite article, pronominal suffixes, and prepositions.<sup>8</sup>

Finally, Liebmann pointed to a few cases where the translator’s “dogmatic views” were responsible for some of LXX Isaiah’s divergences from the Hebrew. The translator’s usage of *διὰ* “on account of” for *תחת* “under” in Isa 24:5 and *ὅτι ἡμάρτοσαν* “they sinned” for *וַיֵּשׁוּמוּ* “they became guilty” in Isa 24:6 all point to the translator’s ideology. The more so as, in Liebmann’s view, *ἀφανίζω* “to destroy” could have been used to translate *וַיֵּשׁוּמוּ*.<sup>9</sup>

---

5. Ernst Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27,” ZAW 22 (1902): 6, 7.

6. Ibid., 26.

7. Ibid., 28, 39. For a detailed discussion, see 27–39. In the same year, H. B. Swete (*An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* [2nd ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902; repr., Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2003], 315–16), expressed a completely different view of the Isaiah translator, when he stated that “the Psalms and more especially the Book of Isaiah shew obvious signs of incompetence.”

8. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 45.

9. Ibid., 49.

The year 1902 saw another important publication. Alfred Zillesen, in his “Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40–66),”<sup>10</sup> tried to show that related phraseology in MT Isa 40–66 is the reason behind many of LXX Isaiah’s departures. He argued that the translator borrowed phrases from elsewhere in the book for his translation of certain verses. In these cases, LXX Isaiah would have no bearing in MT’s readings.<sup>11</sup> Zillesen proposed that LXX Isaiah carried out two types of corrections in light of related phrases in Isa 40–66. The first type was some sort of improvement of the Hebrew, for example Isa 40:5 (cf. 52:10); 41:6 (cf. 41:5); 42:1 (cf. 45:4); 46:11 (cf. 48:15); 48:16 (cf. 45:19). The second were cases where the Greek reworked, altered, and even replaced the Hebrew due to related phraseology. Some examples of this type are 41:28 (cf. 63:5); 42:4 (cf. 11:2; 51:5); 44:23 (cf. 52:9); 45:8 (cf. 44:23; 49:13). Moreover, Zillesen also identified seven cases outside Isa 40–66 that influenced translations in LXX Isa 40–66. Of these seven, three come from outside the book of Isaiah (Exod 17:6 [cf. Isa 48:21]; Amos 9:14 [cf. Isa 45:13]; Ps 37:6 [cf. Isa 51:5]); the others come from the book of Isaiah itself (42:4 [cf. 11:2]; 45:9 [cf. 28:24; 29:16]; 61: 7 [cf. 35:10]).<sup>12</sup>

Zillesen also discussed whether the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translator or the translator himself was the source of the divergences found in LXX Isa 40–66. He claimed that, in a few cases, the Hebrew seemed to be the source that motivated the changes; in most cases, however, the source of the change was found in the translation itself. Still prone to viewing LXX Isaiah’s value for textual criticism, Zillesen conjectured whether a precursor form of the *Vorlage*, supplied, for instance, with interlinear parallel sentences, was behind the translator’s changes.<sup>13</sup> Later on, Joseph Ziegler would pick up on Zillesen’s inference of “interlinear parallel sentences” to develop his theory of glosses in the margin of the translator’s *Vorlage*.<sup>14</sup>

In 1904, Richard R. Ottley also addressed the differences between the MT and LXX. Contrary to Scholz’s previous research, Ottley discarded the idea that a different *Vorlage* once lay behind the Greek. Instead, he argued that LXX Isaiah’s deviations originated with the translator’s faulty knowledge of the Hebrew language.<sup>15</sup> Although he conjectured that the translator may

10. Alfred Zillesen, “Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40–66)” ZAW 22 (1902): 238–63.

11. Ibid., 240.

12. Ibid., 261.

13. Ibid.

14. See Jean Koenig, *L’herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d’après les témoins textuels d’Isaïe* (VTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1982), 24.

15. Richard R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandri-*

have used an illegible manuscript, he saw the translator's imperfect knowledge of the Hebrew as the main cause for LXX Isaiah's departures.<sup>16</sup> For instance, Ottley claimed that "often we can see the translator losing his clue, and going gradually astray," citing LXX Isa 24:23 as one example. He suggested *ταχέσεται* "it will melt, dissolve" (Isa 24:23a) resulted from the translator's faulty rendering of *ובושה* "it will be ashamed" with *πεσείται* "it will fall" in the parallel clause of Isa 24:23b.<sup>17</sup> Differences explained as mistakes, misreading or guessing abound in Ottley's work.<sup>18</sup>

Four years before Ziegler's monumental work, Johann Fischer devoted attention to the *Vorlage* behind LXX Isaiah. Against F. Wutz, whose work argued the LXX translators worked from a Hebrew text that had been transcribed into Greek, Fischer proposed that the *Vorlage* behind LXX Isaiah was a consonantal Hebrew text.<sup>19</sup> Noticing that the characteristic feature of LXX Isaiah is its shorter text when compared to MT,<sup>20</sup> Fischer discussed the question of how to account for this phenomenon. He then paid great attention to the style of the translation. Basically, he offered four explanations: minuses in the Greek text itself; translator's intentional minuses; translator's contraction of words or phrases; gaps in the translator's *Vorlage*. Although Fischer argued that a gap in the translator's *Vorlage* should not be denied, he strongly emphasized that, in general, the differences between LXX Isaiah's *Vorlage* and MT were not that significant and that their nature was clear. By this, he meant that a different *Vorlage* is not the reason for most of LXX Isaiah's divergences from the Hebrew. Instead, the translator should be taken as responsible for

---

*nus*) (London: Clay & Sons, 1904–1906), 1:49: "[I]n Isaiah I find it hard to see that the LXX gives any proof at all (unless in a few isolated exceptions) of an older or superior Hebrew text; because the translators seem to have been so constantly mistaken in reading their Hebrew, or unable to translate it, as to deprive their witness of all authority."

16. *Ibid.*, 1:50: "The failures of the translator (or translators) in reading his original may have been largely justified by illegibility of MSS., and very likely by abbreviations also; the actual script may have been very difficult. But over and above all this, it seems as if his knowledge of Hebrew was imperfect; and if this was so, he may have thought that he saw before him not merely something different from reality, but something such as no skilled Hebrew writer would have written."

17. *Ibid.*, 1:50; 2:224.

18. *Ibid.*, 2:222, 225. In 1:51, Ottley characterized the "mistakes and misreadings" in LXX Isaiah as "so numerous."

19. Johann Fischer, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaías den LXX vor?* (BZAW 56; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930), iii.

20. *Ibid.*, 6.

the differences between LXX Isaiah and MT.<sup>21</sup> To prove his point, Fischer proceeded to a discussion of translation style.

Fischer argued that the method of translation was not a word-for-word rendition but, rather, a free translation. The aim of the translator was to bring the meaning of his text into Greek. Fischer also argued that in places where his *Vorlage* was easy to translate, the translation was more literal. Contrarily, the translation was freer in places where the *Vorlage* was difficult to render. In those places, the translator struggled to make the meaning of his text clear, using the context to clarify it. As an example, Fischer pointed to Isa 33:18, where the translator read אֲתֵּהְמוֹנְלִים “the towers” as אֲתֵּהְמוֹנְלִים “the ones being caused to be great” and, in the light of the context, rendered it with τοὺς τρεφόμενους “the ones being caused to grow up.”<sup>22</sup>

Furthermore, Fischer stressed that a free translation style characterizes LXX Isaiah.<sup>23</sup> In Isa 10:26, for example, ἐν τόπῳ θλίψεως “in the place of affliction” renders בצור עורב. For him, the translator interpreted the image of “raven” (עורב) as a cipher for unhappiness. A free translation style included also free exegesis as in the rendition of שִׁשְׁךָ “your root” with τὸ σπέρμα σου “your seed” (Isa 14:30). The elimination of anthropomorphism is also found in LXX Isaiah. Fischer explained the rendition of פֶּלֶא יוֹעֵץ אֵל גִּבּוֹר with μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος (Isa 9:5) as due, perhaps, to the translator’s ignoring גִּבּוֹר to avoid anthropomorphism. Finally, he argued the translation is full of many additions to clarify the Hebrew.<sup>24</sup>

Moreover, Fischer argued the translator deliberately exchanged, added or disregarded certain consonants in his *Vorlage*. For instance, the rendition of נוֹאֲלִו “they acted foolishly” with ἐξέλιπον “they failed” (Isa 19:13) reflects the verbal form נִלְאוּ “they grew weary.” In this case, the translator overlooked the consonant *waw* to produce the meaning “they failed.” There are also other places where the translator added (e.g., 24:14; 25:2–3; 26:17–18; 27:1), omitted (e.g., 25:11; 26:9) or changed the order of consonants, especially when they had the same shape as ד or ר.<sup>25</sup>

Fischer also argued that the translator frequently used knowledge of Aramaic for his translation. He gave several examples highlighting this feature.<sup>26</sup>

21. Ibid., 8.

22. Ibid., 9, 10.

23. With Fischer, the view of the translation style as free had considerably changed from Swete’s 1902 claim that LXX Isaiah’s translation was so literal as to render “entire sentences” as “unintelligible” (*An Introduction*, 324).

24. Ibid., 11.

25. Ibid., 10–11.

26. Ibid., 9. Later, Arie van der Kooij (*Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: ein Beitrag*



He claimed that because Aramaic was a living language for the translator, he was an expert in the Aramaic language and had better control of it than of Hebrew.<sup>27</sup>

After Fischer, Ziegler published his groundbreaking monograph on LXX Isaiah.<sup>28</sup> In this study, he addressed the fundamental question of the relation between MT and LXX Isaiah. For him, it essentially entailed two alternatives: either the translator had an identical *Vorlage* to MT or the translator's source text markedly diverged from MT.<sup>29</sup> Together with Liebmann and Fischer, Ziegler proposed that an evaluation of LXX Isaiah's relation to MT must pay attention to the translation style. In this respect, he discussed at length matters such as minuses and pluses, the translator's handling of comparisons, his use of related phraseology throughout the translation, and the translator's lexical choices vis-à-vis his Alexandrian background. He categorically argued that a free translation style characterizes LXX Isaiah and that this translation has much in common with LXX Job/Proverbs and some types of *targumimic* literature.<sup>30</sup> Rather than a word-for-word translation, Ziegler viewed the translator as someone who paid attention to the context during the production of his translation.

A case in point is the translator's handling of difficult Hebrew words, for which he reached to the context for help. For instance, the noun דָּוָן "dawn, crepuscule" was rendered as τὸ ὀψέ "late in the day, in the evening" because of τὸ πρωῒ "in the morning" at the beginning of the verse (Isa 5:11). Similarly, ἡ ψυχὴ was used for the difficult דָּוָן to create a parallel with ἡ καρδία at the beginning of the verse (Isa 21:4).<sup>31</sup> Thus, the translator did not produce his work mechanically. Rather, he paid careful attention to both the immediate and broader contexts of a given passage.

In his discussion of LXX Isaiah's minuses, Ziegler argued that, for the most part, they originated with the translator himself, who intentionally and unintentionally left words out of his translation. Most importantly, Ziegler claimed that the translator did not feel strictly bound to his *Vorlage* in the

---

zur *Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* [OBO 35; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981], 69) would doubt Fischer's claim that the translator utilized his Aramaic knowledge "very often."

27. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 10.

28. Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA 12/3: Münster: 1934).

29. *Ibid.*, 1.

30. *Ibid.*, 7.

31. *Ibid.*, 9. For more examples, see 9–12.

sense that he was not producing a literal word-for-word translation.<sup>32</sup> In fact, Ziegler assumed that the translator's *Vorlage*, with few exceptions, was identical to MT.<sup>33</sup>

In his discussion of "Gegenseitige Beeinflussung sinnverwandter Stellen in der Js-LXX," Ziegler advanced his main thesis that the translator had a sufficiently good general knowledge of the book of Isaiah as a whole and that the exegesis of several related phrases may clarify many divergences. He argued that many of the Greek's differences from MT originated with the translator's technique of rendering one passage in the light of another in the book. In Ziegler's own words:

Der Js. Übers. scheint überhaupt sein Buch sehr gut dem Inhalte nach im Gedächtnis gehabt zu haben; denn es begegnen viele Wiedergaben, die sich nur auf Grund der Exegese nach sinnverwandten Stellen erklären lassen. Gerade bei der Js-LXX darf irgendein Wort oder eine Wendung, die vom MT abweicht, nicht aus dem Zusammenhang genommen werden und für sich allein betrachtet werden, sondern muß nach dem ganzen Kontext der Stelle und ihren Parallelen gewertet werden; erst so läßt sich manche Differenz der LXX gegenüber dem MT erklären.<sup>34</sup>

Ziegler devoted about forty pages to a discussion of LXX Isa 1–66, pointing to cases where the translation of one passage was influenced by another. With the programmatic statement above, he advanced LXX Isaiah's research significantly by highlighting that the translator made use of his knowledge of the content of the whole book for his rendition of particular passages.

In the last chapter, "Der alexandrinisch-ägyptische Hintergrund der Js-LXX," Ziegler argued that LXX Isaiah must also be studied in the context

---

32. Ibid., 46–47: "Hier erhebt sich die Frage: Hat die LXX bereits in ihrer Vorlage die betreffenden Versteile und Worte nicht gelesen? Wie oben bemerkt worden ist, hat Fischer richtig erkannt, daß LXX-Vorlage und MT sich nicht weit voneinander entfernen; doch besteht kein Zweifel, daß in unserem MT manche Versteile und glos-senartige Bemerkungen stehen, die LXX noch nicht gelesen hat. Jedoch geht bei dem größten Teil des Minus die Ursache auf den Übers. selbst zurück; er hat oftmals Satz-teile und Worte absichtlich und unabsichtlich ausgelassen. ... Der Js-Übers. fühlte sich nicht strenge an seine Vorlage gebunden und hatte auch keineswegs die Absicht, wörtlich und genau, Wort für Wort zu übersetzen; deshalb hat er einfach schwierige, seltene Wörter ausgelassen, manche Sätze verkürzt und zusammengezogen." For a recent, systematic study of LXX Isaiah's minuses and pluses, confirming Ziegler's conclusions above, see Mirjam van der Vorm Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses* (SCS 61; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).

33. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 22.

34. Ibid., 135.

of the Alexandrian world. For him, the translator attempted to produce a translation that would be comprehensible to Alexandrian Jews and, in doing so, resorted to the lexicon of his homeland. LXX Isaiah, thus, acquired a new meaning in Greek clothes. This implied, so argued Ziegler, that a proper understanding of LXX Isaiah requires an acquaintance with the cultural world of the translator.<sup>35</sup> For instance, in the light of papyri documents, Ziegler argued that ἀνίημι in LXX Isa 27:10 means “to abandon” as the same verb appears in P. Tebt. I 72, 36, dating from the second century BCE, with this meaning: γῆν ἀνιέναι εἰς νομάς “to abandon the land as pasturage.”<sup>36</sup> This example and others point to the importance of comparing LXX Isaiah with contemporary papyri texts.<sup>37</sup>

### 1.1.3. LXX Isaiah and the Personality of the Translator: The Translator’s Theology

The year 1934 also witnessed an influential shift of focus in LXX Isaiah research with Karl F. Euler’s study of LXX Isa 53. The value of Euler’s work lies in its methodology. Rather than being interested in LXX Isa 53 as a translational text, Euler focused on it as a text in its own right. He took LXX Isa 53 not as a text that reflects faithfully the ideology of its *Vorlage* but as a text that communicates its own ideas. He thus made a distinction between LXX Isaiah as a translational text and as a text in its own right. In the latter capacity, Euler viewed LXX Isaiah as reflecting its translator’s particular beliefs. As he put it:

Wenn im ersten Teil der Arbeit eine Übersetzung und Erklärung des LXX-Textes von Jes 53 gegeben wird, so ist der eben bezeichnete Gesichtspunkt

35. Ibid., 175–77.

36. Ibid., 180.

37. For recent research on the cultural context of LXX Isaiah in the light of contemporary papyri literature, cf. Michaël N. van der Meer, “Trendy Translations in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Study of the Vocabulary of the Greek Isaiah 3,18–23 in the Light of Contemporary Sources,” in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006* (WUNT 1/219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 581–96; idem, “Papyrological Perspectives on the Septuagint of Isaiah,” in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives. Papers Read at the Conference on the Septuagint of Isaiah, Held in Leiden 10–11 April 2008* (ed. Arie van der Kooij and Michaël N. van der Meer; CBET 55; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 107–33; idem, “Visions from Memphis and Leontopolis: The Phenomenon of the Vision Reports in the Greek Isaiah in the Light of Contemporary Accounts from Hellenistic Egypt,” in *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. Michaël N. van der Meer et al., VTSup 138; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 281–316.

bestimmend gewesen, den LXX-Text als selbständigen Text zu betrachten und nicht als einen Übersetzungstext, der die Gedanken des hebräischen Textes nur wortgetreu wiedergäbe. Der Text als übersetzter Text bleibt unberücksichtigt; hier ist er selbständiger Text, der bestimmte und verständliche Aussagen macht.<sup>38</sup>

Euler claimed further that LXX Isa 53 as a text in its own right carries an ideology of its own, independent from its Hebrew *Vorlage*:

Es war ja verschiedentlich schon betont worden, daß der LXX-Text, obwohl er ein übersetzter Text ist, durchaus selbständig ist in seinem Gedankeninhalt.... Denn die Übersetzung kann beeinflusst sein von einem schon vorherrschenden Glauben hinsichtlich des Ebed, der in den Kreisen, aus denen die LXX stammt, beheimatet ist. Ebenso wie Targum und rabbinische Literatur in dieser Hinsicht eine bestimmte Meinung vertreten, könnten ja auch die LXX-Übersetzer eine solche haben, die sie durch ihre Übersetzung zum Ausdruck bringen.<sup>39</sup>

Euler's work represented a major shift in emphasis in LXX Isaiah studies. Rather than studying LXX Isaiah as a translation, focusing on translation style as had so often been done before 1934, Euler argued it should be studied as a text in its own right that carried its own independent ideology. After Euler's publication, one notices in retrospect that scholars began to be more and more interested not only in translation style, but also in LXX Isaiah's ideology.

In 1948, Isac L. Seeligmann published his *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems*. This work, which would become his *opus magnum*, has rightly been deemed "the most significant attempt to use the Septuagint as evidence of Jewish theology."<sup>40</sup> Seeligmann deemed LXX Isaiah as a work that reflected the translator's personal views and his surrounding context:

The translation of Isaiah is characterized in numerous places not only by a fairly considerable independence of the Hebrew text, but also by the fact that it evinces an equally marked influence from the surrounding cultural atmosphere, as well as expressing the author's personal views. This translation, in

---

38. Karl F. Euler, *Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jes 53 in der Griechischen Bibel* (BWANT 66; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934), 2.

39. *Ibid.*, 10.

40. Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 102.

fact, is almost the only one among the various parts of the Septuagint which repeatedly reflects contemporaneous history.<sup>41</sup>

Seeligmann would see reflected in LXX Isaiah events from the Maccabean period, other “contemporaneous and parallel political developments in the territories bordering on Palestine,” the history of Ptolemaic Egypt, as well as events of the broader Hellenistic history.<sup>42</sup> As pertaining to the Maccabean period, he discovered allusions to Antiochus IV Epiphanes (Isa 14:18–20), Onias III (Isa 8:8), Jewish emigration to Egypt (Isa 10:24), a Philistine fleet of ships that Jews used for trading voyages (Isa 11:14), anti-Jewish movements in Phoenician cities during the Maccabean wars and reference to a second century BCE expansion of the Nabatean state (Isa 15:7–9).<sup>43</sup> On the history of Ptolemaic Egypt, he uncovered allusions to the situation of Ptolemaic Egypt after Antiochus Epiphanes’s campaigns (Isa 22:5) and to Ethiopian support for Egyptian rebels against the Ptolemeans (Isa 20:5).<sup>44</sup> As for the broader Hellenistic history, Seeligmann saw in the phrase “ships of Carthage” in LXX Isa 23 a reference to Carthage’s attempt to become an agrarian state after the destruction of its shipping and trade.<sup>45</sup> For him, therefore, LXX Isaiah was full of references to its historical period. This was a phenomenon that could only be explained from the perspective of contemporization.<sup>46</sup>

It is important to point out that Seeligmann believed that one can only find the translator’s references to historical allusions or expressions of his beliefs in places where his translation was free. Talking about LXX Isaiah’s departures from its Hebrew source, Seeligmann claimed that

they [inconsistencies] also entitle us to try, on our part, to discover, in isolated, free renderings, certain historical allusions or expressions of the

---

41. Isac L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of Its Problems* (MVEOL 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948; repr. Isac L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognates Studies* [ed. Robert Hanhart and Hermann Spieckermann; FAT 40; Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2004]), 4. See also pp. 79, 82 and idem, “Problemen en perspectieven in het moderne Septuaginta-onderzoek,” *JEOL* 7 (1940), 390b–390e. For an English translation of this article, see “Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research,” *Text* 15 (1990): 169–232.

42. *Ibid.*, 89, 90.

43. *Ibid.*, 83–89. See also idem, “Problemen,” 390d–390e.

44. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 89–90.

45. *Ibid.*, 91.

46. *Ibid.*, 79.

translator's own views and ideas; also in those places where these insertions appear to constitute an element alien to the main context.<sup>47</sup>

Seeligmann argued that the translator had an atomistic approach to his *Vorlage*. Much like a "feature in the most ancient Jewish exegesis," he introduced interpretations of words or phrases into his translation without paying attention to the immediate context. For that reason, Seeligmann found it unlikely "to discover logical connexions in any chapter or part of a chapter in our Septuagint-text."<sup>48</sup> This last statement, as it will be seen below, is at odds with his claim that both literal and free translations reflect the translator's ideology.

In "The Translation as a Document of Jewish-Alexandrian Theology," which is the last chapter of his *opus magnum*, Seeligmann further elaborated on the "personal views" of LXX Isaiah's author. He discussed the methodology that must be used in writing a history of "Jewish-Alexandrian theology." For him, the sources of the translator's religious notions can be found both in the Bible itself and in Jewish traditions of the time as well as in the Hellenistic worldview.<sup>49</sup> Therefore, both literal and free renderings are important sources of the translator's theology as "both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator concerned."<sup>50</sup> However, Seeligmann decided to focus only on those places where the translation differed ideologically from its source text. He did not intend to write a history of the religious notions of the translator, which included a study of both literal and free renderings, but "to indicate the differences between those embodied in the translation and in the original."<sup>51</sup> Different from his predecessors, he used the term "personality of the translator" to designate a study not only of translation technique, as it had been done until his day, but also of the translator's theological concepts.<sup>52</sup>

---

47. Ibid., 41. However, Seeligmann viewed literal translations as just as important as free ones for the reconstruction of the translator's "religious notions." As he put it, "passages that were translated literally in a given book of the Septuagint, are of equal importance as free paraphrases: both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator concerned" (95).

48. Ibid., 41.

49. Ibid., 95: "The sources of information at our disposal are insufficient for the writing of a history of Jewish-Alexandrian theology. We may say, however, that although its content is for the most part derived from the Bible, it also contains later elements which have their origin partly in popular Jewish traditions that grew outside, and simultaneously with, the Bible and gradually became authoritative, and partly in conscious or unconscious borrowing from the Hellenistic thought-world."

50. Ibid., 95.

51. Ibid., 95.

52. Ibid., 96: "the personality of the translator and his spiritual background." In light

In his discussion of the translator's theological notions, Seeligmann focused on the translator's ideas about God, Torah, and Israel, which form "the nuclear idea of every Jewish-theological conception."<sup>53</sup> He found nuances of the translator's views on God in the epithets he used, such as the more usual κύριος for אלהים/אדני instead of the less frequent δεσπότης; the use of δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη, and ἔλεος; and the nontranslation of צור as an epithet for God to avoid any hint at approval of stone worshiping.<sup>54</sup> Terms such as εὐσεβής, εὐσέβεια, δικαιοσύνη, ἔνδοξος, νόμος, ἀνομέω, and cognates all function as windows into the translator's religious ideas about virtuousness and Torah.<sup>55</sup> Seeligmann also found ample evidence for the translator's view of prophecy as "the revelation of an age-old plan" that is "bound to be fulfilled."<sup>56</sup>

Further, Seeligmann argued the translator had a particular view of exile and diaspora that differed from the Hebrew. Whereas the latter views the exile as a consequence of God's just punishment, the translator views it as the result of "an injustice visited on Israel because of the superior might of other peoples."<sup>57</sup> Exile as an injustice and oppression coupled with a "yearning for national deliverance"<sup>58</sup> shaped the translator's work. LXX Isaiah consistently uses the term ἀδικέω for several Hebrew terms "in regard to the oppressors to whom the Jewish people are subjected."<sup>59</sup> The diaspora feeling can also be seen in the "veneration of national symbols" like Zion and Jerusalem and in the "constant yearning for liberation."<sup>60</sup> The use of σωτηρία, σῶζω, σωτήριον for different Hebrew lexemes indicated that the translator viewed their meaning as primarily "liberation from a powerful political enemy," "escape from a great

---

of Seeligmann's discussion on 95–96, "spiritual background" stands for the religious concepts of the translator. At the conclusion of chapter 4, Seeligmann refers to the "translator's personality or ... mental images" (120).

53. Ibid. See also idem, "Problemen," 389: "De beschrijving van de theologie der vertalers zal—zooals die van iedere Joodsche theologie—gegroepeerd moeten worden, om de begrippen: God, Israël—hierbij ook Messiaansche idee als nationale verlossingskracht—en Thorah."

54. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 97–103. See also idem, "Problemen," 390a: "Dat de vaak voorkomende metafoor van God als Rots of Steen op geen enkele plaats letterlijk wordt vertaald wortelt misschien ten deele in het apologetische streven ook den schijn van instemming met steenvereering te ontgaan."

55. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 103–9.

56. Ibid., 109–10.

57. Ibid., 111.

58. Ibid., 116.

59. Ibid., 111, 112.

60. Ibid., 113.

political disaster,” and “deliverance from exile.”<sup>61</sup> Seeligmann further noted that the concepts of σῶζω and cognates occur “in close connexion with one of the most notable thoughts in Isaiah’s preaching, *i.e.*, the proclamation of the return of the Remnant of Israel”<sup>62</sup> (cf. the parallel occurrence of σῶζω and cognates and κατάλειμμα/καταλείπω in Isa 10:20, 22; 37:32). The translator further identified the “Remnant of the people of Israel with the Jewish diaspora in Hellenistic Egypt” and also in Mesopotamia (Isa 11:16; 19:24–25).<sup>63</sup> Because the translation of Isaiah betrays unique ideas that differ from MT, Seeligmann argued that a study of the “personality of the translator” involved not only translation style but also the translator’s theology. And the ideology of the translator would indeed become the general focus of later works.

In 1951, Leonard H. Brockington published an important article that dealt with the translator’s interest in the theme of δόξα, which appears sixty-eight times in LXX Isaiah but translates כבוד only twenty-eight times. The high frequency of δόξα in Isaiah is striking in comparison with other LXX books that translate the *Tanach* where δόξα occurs 270 times and translates כבוד 180 times. The difference in frequency is 2:3 for other LXX books versus 7:17 for LXX Isaiah. Brockington argued that δόξα had a theological significance for the translator and that it “was associated, directly or indirectly, with God’s redemptive work among men.”<sup>64</sup> Substantiation for Brockington’s claim of the soteriological meaning of δόξα can be found in places where the translator introduced it when his *Vorlage* referred to “salvation” (e.g., Isa 12:2; 44:23). The opposite also proves Brockington’s point. In Isa 40:5; 60:1–7, for instance, the translator introduced σωτηρία where his *Vorlage* referred to “glory.”<sup>65</sup> Brockington saw the “individuality of the translator” in his increased use of δόξα as a concept denoting salvation.<sup>66</sup>

Subsequently, Jean Coste published an article on LXX Isa 25:1–5, in which he made important methodological points. He approached LXX Isa 25:1–5 as a “translational” text, as a literary unit, as a text expressing certain beliefs, and as a text that functions as a channel for revelation.<sup>67</sup> As a translation, he concluded that LXX Isa 25:1–5 showed itself “comme un échec presque complet.”<sup>68</sup>

---

61. Ibid., 114.

62. Ibid., 115.

63. Ibid., 116, 117.

64. Leonard H. Brockington, “The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in ΔΟΞΑ,” VT 1 (1951): 26.

65. Ibid., 30–32.

66. Ibid., 31.

67. Jean Coste, “Le texte grec d’Isaïe XXV, 1–5,” RB 61 (1954), 37.

68. Ibid., 50.



Contrarily, when studied in its own right,<sup>69</sup> LXX Isa 25:1–5 presented itself as an ordered and coherent text. He further concluded that LXX Isa 25:1–5, as a literary and conceptual text, shows that an active interpretive plan was already at work even before its translation had started, reflecting the translator's personal piety and faith.<sup>70</sup>

As a text that expresses the translator's "personal piety and faith," Coste characterized LXX Isa 25:1–5 as a messianic thanksgiving song that celebrates the destruction of the wicked and the deliverance of the Israelites, who will recognize the Lord in Zion.<sup>71</sup> In his lexical analysis, he claimed the themes of poverty and deliverance, on one hand, and expectation and messianic gift, on the other, are the themes of LXX Isa 25:1–5. As such, he viewed it as the "song of the poor," which reflects a spiritual movement in Judaism that brought the concepts of poverty and humility to the fore of its religious faith.<sup>72</sup> For Coste, therefore, LXX Isa 25:1–5, as a text of its own, betrays the translator's ideology.

After Coste, the Portuguese scholar J. C. M. das Neves sought to recover the theology of the translator in his study of LXX Isa 24.<sup>73</sup> He approached this text in three levels. The first discussed the exegesis and theology of MT; the second paid attention to the LXX's "philological differences" in comparison with MT; and the third discussed the exegesis and theology of the Greek text.<sup>74</sup>

Das Neves understood that the translator's religious conceptions determined his translation and the text as a literary unit. On the level of translation, das Neves noted that the translator sometimes read the Hebrew in slightly different ways from MT/1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. Note, for instance, ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός "the poor people" for עַם עֲנִי "the strong people," reflecting a reading of MT as עַם עֲנִי. Based on several examples, das Neves concluded that the Isaiah translator was well acquainted with the Hebrew language but that he manipulated it to express his religious beliefs.<sup>75</sup>

For das Neves, the translator's reading method consisted essentially of "re-readings" and "actualizations." The former takes the Hebrew differently from its intended simple meaning while actualizations find the fulfillment of

---

69. A similar approach had already been advanced for LXX Isa 52:13–53:12. See the above discussion of Euler's *Die Verkündigung*.

70. Coste, "Le texte grec," 51.

71. Ibid., 51.

72. Ibid., 59–60.

73. J. C. M. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías (Cap. 24 de Isaías)* (Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973).

74. Ibid., 265.

75. Ibid., 266. For more examples, see 265–66.

former prophecies in the events of the translator's time.<sup>76</sup> These two methods combined are used to express the translator's religious views about two contemporary Jewish groups: the pro- and contrahellenization.<sup>77</sup> The existence of these two groups forms the core of LXX Isa 24's theology:

Em todo o texto, como se vê, perpassa sempre a mesma mentalidade de *atualização*, tendo por base as duas facções de judeus: os ímpios que se aliam aos inimigos na sua política e os fiéis ao jahvismo, prontos a sofrer com amor e com alegria e até mesmo a morrer *com morte de fogo* (Is. 9, 3–5; p. 232 s), o que nos indica tratar-se de espírito originado numa facção religiosa.<sup>78</sup>

Das Neves identified several themes related to the group faithful to Yahweh. This group is found in dispersion in Egypt (cf. LXX Isa 18: 2, 7; 25:5; 27:12; 33:17; 41:9a, 2, 5; 45:22; 49:6; 52:10; 62:11) and is expecting its redemption (cf. LXX Isa 33:13; 41:1; 45:16, 22; 48:20; 49:1, 6; 51:5; 52:10; 60:9; 62:11). He further pointed out that this group in dispersion is sometimes referred to as the ones “left, spared” (cf. LXX Isa 4:2; 10:17, 11:10; 21; 19; 13:12; 20:6; 28:5, 6–28), the “poor” (cf. LXX Isa 25:1–5) and the “humiliated” (cf. LXX Isa 26:3). Related to the “poor” are concepts such as “joy” (εὐφροσύνη), glory (δόξα), and righteousness (δικαιοσύνη). The “spared-poor-humiliated” group shares an eschatological hope for the messianic Jerusalem.<sup>79</sup>

Contrarily, the party of unfaithful Jews is denominated by terms like πλούσιος/πλοῦτος (with the exception of LXX Isa 32:18; 33:20); ἀμαρτωλός, a

76. Ibid., 268. For das Neves's more detailed discussion of actualization in comparison with Daniel and the *pesharim*, see idem, “A Teologia dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías,” *Itin* (Portugal) 43 (1964), 26–28.

77. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 268, 269.

78. Ibid., 269. See also his “A Teologia dos Setenta,” 19, 21.

79. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 269–74. For a more detailed discussion of das Neves's view of the “remnant” in LXX Isaiah, see idem, “Isaías 7,14 no Texto Masorético e no Texto Grego: A obra de Joachim Becker,” *Did* 2 (1972), 106. Das Neves summarizes the theology of the “remnant” in LXX Isaiah as follows: (1) While MT speaks of the rest of “trees” or of the people in general terms, LXX refer to the “remnant” as a religious concept, as the faithful and pious class among the people. It also applies daily metaphors such as agriculture, for instance, in a personal way and with reference to the “remnant” of Israel; (2) the “remnant” in LXX Isaiah is characterized as “poor” and “small” (LXX Isa 24:6); (3) whenever MT refers to the “remnant” as a specific class and in religious terms, the Greek tends to emphasize those references; (4) the “remnant” relates to the people in diaspora in Egypt who will return with gladness to Zion after their redemption; (5) this “remnant” suffers injustice from the wicked class of the people—but those injustices are considered to be from God, who uses them to purify and sanctify, preparing them for future messianic happiness.

concept that is stressed more in the LXX than in MT; ἄρχοντες,<sup>80</sup> who are in fact referred to with the term ἀμαρτωλός above; βουλή/μάταια as the expression of political aspects devised by the ἄρχοντες; ἔθνη, although this term can also refer to the faithful people of God and the present Jerusalem in its situation of impiety.<sup>81</sup> It is necessary to note that das Neves is not saying that the terms above in all their occurrences in LXX Isaiah always refer to either the faithful or the unfaithful group. Instead, he noted that these terms seem to be associated with one or the other group at several places in LXX Isaiah.

In his analysis of LXX Isa 24, das Neves arrived at the following important conclusions: First, he noted that there are substantial differences between MT and LXX. He argued that it is not possible to explain these differences as errors of a mechanical nature only, such as confusion of consonants, omissions, dittography, and so on. Rather, such differences betray the “personality of the translator.” Das Neves also noted that the Greek text, when studied by itself, presents its own well-defined thought. This “well-defined thought” can only be extracted by paying careful attention to the smallest particularities of the text. The differences between MT and LXX originate in the translator’s religious views rather than in a faulty understanding of the Hebrew text.<sup>82</sup> LXX Isaiah is, thus, a theological interpretation of the Hebrew, made necessary by the historical and religious actualizations of its historical background.<sup>83</sup>

Another important article that highlighted aspects of the social and political environment of LXX Isaiah was Frederic Raurell’s “‘Archontes’ en la interpretació midràshica d’Is-LXX.”<sup>84</sup> He called attention to the social background of Palestinian Jews in the second century BCE who lived under the oppressive control of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. He interpreted ἄρχοντες (Isa 3:4, 14; 14:5) as designating leaders of the Jewish community in Jerusalem favoring Antiochus IV’s policy of hellenization. Specifically, the ἄρχοντες were economic oppressors of the poor (πτωχός) by means of harsh taxation (cf. ἀπαιτῶν in Isa 3:12; 14:4).<sup>85</sup> Behind this harsh tax policy were Antiochus IV’s war indem-

80. For a more in-depth discussion of ἄρχοντες in LXX Isaiah, see Frederic Raurell, “‘Archontes’ en la Interpretació Midràshica d’Is-LXX” *RCT* 1 (1976), 315–74.

81. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 274–75.

82. Ibid., 265. On p. 43, das Neves claims that the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek can be found in the “mentalidade teológica do nosso tradutor.” The reason is that LXX Isaiah is more an interpretation than a translation.

83. Ibid., 278. For a critical review of das Neves, see Frederic Raurell, “La teologia de Js-LXX en un studio reciente,” *EstFr* 76 (1975): 409–21.

84. Raurell, “Archontes,” 315–74.

85. For the theme of economic exploitation in LXX Isaiah, see Ronald L. Troxel, “Economic Plunder as a Leitmotif in LXX-Isaiah,” *Bib* 83 (2002): 375–91; idem, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*

nities due to the Romans.<sup>86</sup> Thus, the translator's employment of the term ἄρχοντες reflected his oppressive socio-political condition under Antiochus IV's control of Jerusalem.

In 1979, John W. Olley made an important contribution to LXX Isaiah studies. The purpose of his monograph was to study how the translator understood passages in which the root קִדַּשׁ occurs as well as the "intended meaning of δικαιοσύνη and related words."<sup>87</sup> With such a study, Olley tried to discuss the question of the extent to which the translator's use of δικαιοσύνη and its cognates can be characterized as Jewish Greek.<sup>88</sup> Specifically, he sought to investigate why the translator "used certain words and what meaning he saw in those words in their context."<sup>89</sup> He assumed that "[T]he translators believed that the words and structures they used were at least reasonably capable of conveying the meaning they saw in the original, allowing for individual theological views and linguistic abilities. This does not mean that they necessarily agreed with the meaning they saw."<sup>90</sup>

Olley called for a contextual study of δικαιοσύνη and cognates in their LXX literary contexts. He warned "one cannot assume that, because a particular Hebrew word is 'usually' rendered by a particular Greek word, therefore there is considerable semantic overlap." Further, he claimed that "unusual" renderings must be analyzed in their literary context, under the assumption "that the translator intended his reading to make sense."<sup>91</sup>

---

(SJSJ 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 201–9. In his article "Economic Plunder," Troxel identified the harsh taxation under the Seleucids as the background of the motif of "economic plunder" in LXX Isaiah: "This leitmotif accords with the broad consensus that LXX-Isa was translated in the second quarter of the second century BCE, when Seleucid domination of Jerusalem and Judea was being thrown off. The level of taxes under the Hellenists had become repressive, making relief from Seleucid taxation a significant consequence of the revolt. That seems a likely explanation for the translator's preoccupation with economic plunder as the supreme crime of the people's rulers, with removal of such oppression constituting a signal feature of divine deliverance" (390).

86. Raurell, "Archontes," 365: "Les elevades indemnitzacions de guerra que els selèucides havien de pagar als romans les hagueren de pagar els pobres súbdits jueus. Per aquestes mateixes raons econòmiques els selèucides intentaren apoderar-se dels tresors del temple. Aquest intent sembla que fracassà al principi; tanmateix, el 175, Antíoc IV Epifanés va depositar el sumo sacerdote legítim i vengué dues vegades el càrrec als dos millor licitadors."

87. John W. Olley, *'Righteousness' in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Contextual Study* (SBLSCS 8; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979), 1.

88. Ibid.

89. Ibid., 11.

90. Ibid., 5.

91. Ibid., 125.

Olley concluded that “while the fact that he [the translator] uses *δικαιο-* words is due to *קדש* in MT, this is not simply a case of ‘automatic response translation’ since no instance has been found where this leads to a meaning unrecognizable on the basis of secular Greek usage.”<sup>92</sup> Even though Olley conceded that some “meanings do however undergo slight semantic expansion due to their usage within a Jewish theological framework,”<sup>93</sup> they do not constitute “‘Jewish Greek’ but rather Greek words with some new associations added due to the Jewish context.”<sup>94</sup>

Finally, Olley uncovered a “consistent picture of some aspects of the translator’s theology and technique” in the latter’s “linguistic preferences.”<sup>95</sup> He pointed out that the translator, while following the precedent in the Pentateuch in his use of *ἀσεβής* for *עש*, also employs “*ἀσεβής* for other roots when reference is to Israel’s enemies” and as a description of its oppressors.<sup>96</sup> On the other hand, the translator usually reserves *ἀνομ-* words as a reference to Israel and “more generally to wrongdoing and wrongdoers.”<sup>97</sup> Lastly, *ἀδικ-* words are employed to describe actions of oppression either by “Israel’s leaders” or by others “who have attacked and oppressed Israel (cf. Isa 10:20; 21:3; 23:12; 25:3f; 51:23; 65:25).”<sup>98</sup>

Olley summarized the translator’s theology as follows: first, because “acts of oppression by rulers and judges and attacks on other nations are, as in secular Greek understanding, ‘unjust,’” the translator employs *ἀδικ-* words; *ἀσεβ-* words would not be appropriate in those contexts. Second, given the oppressors’ nature as “wrongdoers” and “their failure to serve the Lord,” the translator employs *ἀσεβ-* words, as they are most appropriate for those contexts. And, third, the translator reserves *ἀνομ-* words to refer to “Israel’s disobedience of the law of God.”<sup>99</sup> Detecting the translator’s theology in his careful contextual study of the translator’s linguistic preferences, Olley proposed the translator’s theology as the reason for some of his lexical choices.

In 1981, Arie van der Kooij engaged in an important discussion of the proper methodological use of the ancient versions (LXX, *θ*, *α*, *σ*, Targ., Pesh., and Vulg.) and of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> for the textual criticism of MT Isaiah. He argued that a study of the textual witnesses in their own milieu must precede

---

92. Ibid.

93. Ibid., 125–26.

94. Ibid., 126.

95. Ibid., 122.

96. Ibid.

97. Ibid.

98. Ibid.

99. Ibid., 123.

any text-critical work.<sup>100</sup> In his analysis of LXX Isaiah, van der Kooij focused on passages where fulfillment-interpretation played an important role, intending to provide a better understanding of the character of LXX Isaiah, its translator, and his background.<sup>101</sup> Much like his predecessors, he paid attention to the translator's theology and his historical background while speaking of the "character of LXX Isaiah."

Van der Kooij identified several cases of fulfillment-interpretation. He argued that the translator often interpreted references to the "king" of Assyria or Babylon as a cipher for the Seleucid kings Antiochus III/IV (e.g., Isa 8:7; 10:9, 10; 14:19–20, 22–27).<sup>102</sup> He further identified two steps in the translator's reworking of Isa 22:5–11. For him, the differences between MT and LXX Isa 22:5–11 reflect events occurring in Jerusalem around 167 BCE. At the same time, some of the divergences in that same passage were due to the translator's allusions to reparations that had been previously carried out under the high priest Simon (ca. 200 BCE).<sup>103</sup> Likewise, LXX Isa 8:8's departures find their cause in the translator, who interpreted it as a reference to Antiochus IV's deposition of Onias III as the high priest in Jerusalem.<sup>104</sup> The phrase *πόλις ἀσεδεα* for *עיר ההרס* (Isa 19:18) was used to legitimize the temple in Leontopolis, making useless any assertions that *עיר הצדק* or *קיר הסרח* were in the translator's *Vorlage*.<sup>105</sup> Finally, van der Kooij also identified a negative

---

100. Van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 1: "Dabei kann es aber schon aus Raumgründen nicht die Absicht sein, die Textzeugen des Jesajabusches umfassend zu behandeln. Es soll vielmehr versucht werden diejenigen Aspekte zu beleuchten, die für die textkritische Auswertung der Textzeugen wichtig sein, wie: Gründe und Ursachen textlicher Unterschiede zwischen den Textzeugen und dem masoretischen Text (MT), den Ort der Textzeugen innerhalb der Textgeschichte und das Milieu, in dem sie entstanden sein."

101. Ibid., 34.

102. Ibid., 34–43.

103. Ibid., 49: "die Unterschiede zwischen MT (= meistens Q<sup>a</sup>) und LXX Jes 22,5–11 finden ihre beste Erklärung durch die Annahme, dass der Übersetzer in diesen Versen auf Ereignisse in Jerusalem im Jahr 167 v.Chr. und auf Wiederherstellungsarbeiten zur Zeit des Hohenpriesters Simon anspielt."

104. Ibid., 52. Van der Kooij has changed his view that LXX Isa 8:8 referred to the time of the translator, asserting that it instead refers to the time of Isaiah, cf. Arie van der Kooij, "LXX-Isaiah 8:9 and the Issue of Fulfillment-Interpretation," *Adamantius* 13 (2007), 23; idem, "The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Mode of Reading Prophecies in Early Judaism" in *Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Julie 2006* (ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus; WUNT 1/219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 602.

105. Van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 55. See also idem, "The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16–25: Translation and Interpretation" in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognates Studies: Jerusalem 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars

reference to Menelaus and a positive one to Alcimus in LXX Isa 22:16–18, 20–25 respectively.<sup>106</sup>

Van der Kooij's work contributed greatly to a discussion of the translator's identity. For him, the translator must be seen as a member of the Oniad priesthood circle in Jerusalem, as a scribe, and as a priest. He argued that the translator advocated for the legitimacy of the Leontopolis temple with his rendering πόλις ἀσεδεκ in LXX Isa 19:18. The translator's divergent rendering τοῦ ἰδεῖν ὁδὸν Αἰγύπτου/מִצְרַיִם בְּדֶרֶךְ in Isa 10:24 indicates he approved of Onias IV's escape to Egypt by occasion of Antiochus IV's oppression of Jerusalem in 167 BCE. This piece of evidence led van der Kooij to view Onias IV as the author of LXX Isaiah.<sup>107</sup> Whereas LXX Isaiah's provenance is in Leontopolis, the translator's is Jerusalem. The Jerusalem origin of the translator implied he was acquainted with traditions and events from there.<sup>108</sup>

Van der Kooij also viewed the translator as a scribe based on his translation method ("Art und Weise").<sup>109</sup> The translator's borrowing from the Torah and the Prophets shows that he was very familiar with those books. Likewise, intraharmonization of passages from Hebrew Isaiah points to the translator's solid knowledge of that book.<sup>110</sup> Van der Kooij also found evidence that the translator viewed himself as a scribe in his unique use of γραμματικός for ספר in LXX Isa 33:18. He argued that the translator compared himself to the

---

Press, 1987), 136–37. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 68, had advanced that the translator's *Vorlage* attested to עִיר הַצֶּדֶק. Vaccari ("ΠΟΛΙΣ ΑΣΕΔΕΚ," 356; "Parole Rovesciate," 560, 562–64) had argued that הַסֵּרַח was in the translator's *Vorlage*. The translator then read הַסֵּרַח as הַסֵּדַח by changing the ס into a ס. He then transcribed הַסֵּדַח as ἀσεδεκ. Vaccari supported his proposal with several examples of κ for ח. Recently Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 170–71 resorted to Vaccari's explanation to argue against van der Kooij's proposal that the translator used πόλις ἀσεδεκ to legitimize the Leontopolis temple. Against Vaccari, however, it must be noted that there is no textual evidence that the translator's *Vorlage* read הַסֵּרַח, cf. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>/4QIsa<sup>b</sup>: עִיר הַחֵרֶס; α' θ' ἀρες.

106. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 59, 60.

107. Ibid., 331.

108. Ibid., 60–61.

109. Ibid., 62: "Die Art und Weise, mit der der Übersetzer mit dem Text des Jesajabuches umgeht, macht deutlich, dass er ein *Schriftgelehrter* war" (emphasis original). For van der Kooij's more detailed discussion of the translator as a scribe, cf. his *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision* (VTSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 112–23; idem, "Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint: Who are the Translators?" in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday* (ed. Edward Noort, Florentino García Martínez, and Adam Simon van der Woude; VTSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 219–24.

110. See van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 62–63.



Alexandrian *γραμματικοί*, who were occupied with philological and etymological matters, as well as with the reading and interpretation of literary texts. Like them, the translator was equally engaged in the reading and interpretation of Hebrew Isaiah.<sup>111</sup>

Finally, van der Kooij also considered the translator to be a priest. He found evidence for his view in the advocacy for the Oniad Leontopolis temple in LXX Isa 19:18 and the addition of *ἐπεῖς* in Isa 40:2.<sup>112</sup> As a priest, the translator read Isaiah from the perspective of fulfillment-interpretation and found in the second century BCE the fulfillment of Isaianic announcements.<sup>113</sup> The translator's reading mode was based on his belief that the last days (*τὰ ἐπερχόμενα/τὰ ἔσχατα* in LXX Isa 41:22; 44:7; 45:11; 46:10) of Isaiah had started. In this sense, the translator of Isaiah may be compared to the authors of Daniel and certain Qumran documents. Although LXX Isaiah was produced in Egypt, the link between Leontopolis and Qumran is found in the Jerusalemite background of the translator.<sup>114</sup> The translator's bent to fulfillment-interpretation was also based on his assessment of Isaiah as a vision (cf. *ἰζιπ/ὄρασις* in Isa 1:1 and *ἰζμ/ὄραμα* in Isa 22:1).<sup>115</sup>

Picking up on the research developed by Zillesen and Ziegler, which showed that the translator borrowed phraseology from elsewhere in Isaiah or outside it, Jean Koenig devoted a full-fledged discussion of borrowings in LXX Isaiah. He rejected Ottley's claim that the translator introduced the wording of a particular passage into another unconsciously, accidentally, and unintention-

---

111. Ibid., 63. It is interesting to note that van der Kooij does not make much of *γραμματικός* in LXX Isa 33:18 in his later publications, cf. his passing notes in *Oracle*, 115; "Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint," 221. Accepting van der Kooij's view of the translator as a *γραμματικός*, Troxel (*LXX-Isaiah, passim*) advanced that LXX Isaiah should be studied in light of the work of the *γραμματικοί* in Alexandria. In short, he proposed the translator, like the *γραμματικοί*, was only concerned with linguistic and contextual interpretation. Only very rarely was the translator involved in fulfillment-interpretation. Although Troxel denied van der Kooij's opinion that the translator's use of *γραμματικός* is self-referential, he proceeded to construct a view of the translator that by and large resembles van der Kooij's scribal model, cf. David A. Baer, review of Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, VT 60 (2010): 302.

112. Van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 64–65.

113. Ibid., 95–96, 330–31.

114. Ibid., 64. In his *LXX-Isaiah*, 20, Troxel criticized van der Kooij for comparing LXX Isaiah with the *pesharim* on the basis that the former was produced in Egypt and the latter in Palestine. However, Troxel did not discuss van der Kooij's view of the translator's Palestinian origin, which would allow for a fruitful comparison of LXX Isaiah with documents from Qumran.

115. Van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 64.



tionally.<sup>116</sup> Rather, for him, the translator consciously borrowed phraseology from elsewhere due to an ideological or historical reason.<sup>117</sup>

For instance, Koenig argued that the plus *καὶ οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς πύργον* in Isa 9:9 reflects the historical milieu of the Samaritan schism in the translator's time. He argued the plus originated with a borrowing from Gen 11:3–4. This borrowing reflects the translator's systematic analogical reading of his Scriptures, prompted by the occurrence of *נבנה* and *לבנים* in Gen 11:3, 4 and Isa 9:9.<sup>118</sup> Koenig further argued that the original circumstances of the Isaianic prophecy in Isa 9:11 were lost to the eyes of the translator. He pointed out that “depuis le VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, les oracles d'Is, comme ceux des autres prophètes, avaient acquis une omnivalence temporelle qui permettait d'en tirer des enseignements applicables à des époques autres que celle de leur origine.”<sup>119</sup> Consequently, the mention of Samaria in the Hebrew Isaiah evoked in the translator's mind, as a Jew, the Samaritan schism.<sup>120</sup>

Koenig also discussed what he termed the “religious conditions” that favored the use of “analogical hermeneutics.” Although Hellenistic influence on the production of the LXX is undeniable,<sup>121</sup> Koenig pointed out that the weight of the religious tradition of Judaism and its mode of thinking is also paramount. He noted that the sacralization of the prophetic writings consisted in their use of earlier prophetic oracles that would be applicable to contemporary and even future events. For him, the same process took place in the sacralization of the LXX, a sacralization that would have profited greatly from an “analogical hermeneutic” method of reading the Scripture.<sup>122</sup>

Like the prophetic writings' application of earlier prophecies to a later period, Koenig observed that LXX Isaiah applied the Hebrew to its contemporary history. The translator used “Carthage” for “Tarsis” in Isa 23:1, 10; saw the “Assyrians” in the Hebrew as a cipher for the “Syrians” in the Seleucid period; interpreted the Philistines as a reference to Palestinian coastal Greek cities in the translator's time, and so on. He noted that all these typological changes attest to an actualizing. He even compared LXX Isaiah's reading-

---

116. Koenig, *L'herméneutique*, 6–8.

117. Ibid., 102: “L'herméneutique ouvre la voie de la solution historique. Elle avertit que la transformation méthodique du texte, étant donné les teneurs, doit nécessairement être en rapport avec un motif idéologique d'envergure.”

118. Ibid., 90.

119. Ibid., 101.

120. Ibid.: “Du temps de G ce que la mention de Samarie évoquait nécessairement dans l'esprit d'un juif, qu'il fût palestinien ou membre de la diaspora, c'était le *schisme samaritain*” (emphasis original).

121. Ibid., 33, 49.

122. Ibid., 33–35.

mode with the *pesharim*, claiming that “l’adaptation grecque d’Is est l’une des manifestations qui illustrent un grand courant de spéculation oraculaire sur les Écrits traditionnels d’Israël. Le livre de Daniel et divers écrits de Qumrân, en premier lieu le Habaquq, en sont d’autres témoins.”<sup>123</sup> Thus, for Koenig, the translator’s theology or historical milieu can be detected in his recourse to Scriptural borrowings.

In 1998, van der Kooij produced a monograph on LXX Isa 23 discussing its coherence as a text in its own right. He approached LXX Isa 23 as a text in two levels: first, in comparison with MT and then in its own right. As a text in its own right, van der Kooij probed whether LXX Isa 23 presents a coherent message or whether “significant renderings and passages in the LXX text make sense in relation to each other.”<sup>124</sup> Furthermore, he also focused on whether LXX Isa 23 “not only constitutes, as a translation, a transformation from the linguistic point of view, but also a transformation in the sense of reinterpretation of the temporal application of an ancient prophecy.” The question for him was the translator’s hermeneutics: “did the translator aim at producing a version of an ancient prophecy which would make sense as an oracle at his time?”<sup>125</sup> His conclusion was:

The Greek text in its own right turns out to be a coherent text to a large extent, syntactically, stylistically and semantically. Significant renderings and passages appear to be related to each other. It points to a translator who aimed at producing a meaningful text. The main difference between MT and LXX, on the level of contents, has to do with the presence and contextual function of “Carthage” in the Greek text. In contrast to MT which is about a destruction of Tyre, LXX refers to a destruction of Carthage with its serious consequences for Tyre.<sup>126</sup>

Following his investigation of LXX Isa 23 as a text in its own right, van der Kooij addressed the question as to why this text differs from its Hebrew counterpart as far as its content is concerned. For him, the answer is in the translator’s reading mode. In short, the translator read Isa 23 from the perspective of fulfillment-interpretation, interpreting “the ‘signs’ of his time on the basis of ancestral, prophetic books, in our case the book of Isaiah, in order to help

---

123. *Ibid.*, 45.

124. Van der Kooij, *Oracle*, 75. Van der Kooij had already raised the issue of coherence in his earlier publications; cf. *idem*, “Die Septuaginta Jesajas als Dokument Jüdischer Exegese—Einige Notizen zu LXX-Jes. 7,” in *Übersetzung und Deutung* (Nijkerk: Callenbach: 1977), 93, 99; *idem*, *Textzeugen*, 33–34.

125. Van der Kooij, *Oracle*, 18.

126. *Ibid.*, 87.

his people survive in hard times and to give them, at least the pious ones, hope for the future.”<sup>127</sup> Van der Kooij further pointed to the historical-political events that form the background for LXX Isa 23:

- the destruction of Carthage, which the Romans brought about in 146 BCE;
- the Parthian invasion of Babylonia, which was “presumably understood as a sign of the nearby breakdown of the Seleucid empire;”
- Tyre’s involvement, “in some way or another, in the Hellenization of the city and temple of Jerusalem.”<sup>128</sup>

Finally, van der Kooij further located LXX Isaiah’s reading mode in the context of other Jewish and non-Jewish writings of the second century BCE. In general lines, he highlighted two main aspects involved in the reading of prophecies in that period. First, prophecy was seen as a prediction that had not yet been fulfilled; and, second, the interpretation of prophecies was restricted “to persons of the highest scholarly level of the time.” As he put it:

In short, in the Hellenistic period the mode of reading prophecies as predictions about the recent past, the present and the near future of the reader/interpreter was the prevailing one. The corresponding interpretation of prophecies was a matter of wisdom and scholarship of a specific nature, an ability which was thought to be the privilege of wise men of the highest level within the society of the time.<sup>129</sup>

Another important study appeared in 1999, which focused on an exegetical and theological study of Isaiah’s so-called “servant songs.” Central for our purposes was Eugene R. Ekblad Jr.’s evaluations of the causes of the divergences between MT and LXX of Isa 42:1–8; 49:1–9a; 50:4–11; 52:13–53:12.

---

127. Ibid., 109. See also idem, “Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta,” in *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik* (ed. Henning Graf Reventlow; VWGTh 11; Gütersloh: Kaiser/Gütersloher, 1997), 16.

128. Van der Kooij, *Oracle*, 109.

129. Ibid., 93. See also his “Theologie,” 15: “Es liegen mehrere Texte vor, die darauf hinweisen, daß schriftgelehrte Juden zur Entstehungszeit der LXX die Prophezeiungen Jesajas als Vorhersagen lasen und deuteten, genauso wie es später der Fall ist im Neue Testament, Targum Jonatan zu den Propheten und in der frühchristlichen Exegese. ... Ferner spiegeln Stellen wie Sirach 36,14f. und Tobit 14,5 nicht nur ein lebendiges Interesse an den prophetischen Weissagungen und Erwartungen wider, sonder machen zugleich klar, daß man die Prophezeiungen auf die (nahe) Zukunft bezogen verstand.”

He claimed that most of the divergences signal “a coherent theology and consistent exegetical method.”<sup>130</sup> He urged caution in using LXX Isaiah’s variant readings to reconstruct the translator’s *Vorlage*. Rather, he called for an evaluation of those divergences in the light of the whole book of Isaiah “because the LXX’s word choice is determined by contextual and intertextual exegesis.” More importantly, Ekblad concluded that

the selection of a given word in the LXX is often determined by its semantic rapport ... with other words in other texts which the translator saw as linked for the purpose of clarifying meaning. Scripture is used to interpret and clarify Scripture.<sup>131</sup>

As recently as 2008, Ronald L. Troxel published his *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: the Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, a monograph that in his opinion “lays the foundation for a new view of the translator’s work.”<sup>132</sup> The purpose was to challenge what the author describes as a consensus that has lasted for the past fifty years:

The sketch of the translator of Isaiah promoted by many scholars over the past fifty years (that he deliberately infused his translation with the beliefs and issues of his day) is ... based on undisciplined associations between unique phraseology in the book and significant events known from the second century BCE.<sup>133</sup>

To reevaluate this *status quo*, Troxel argued that it is necessary to take other aspects into consideration:

In order to reevaluate this portrayal, however, we must consider how translation was conceived in the Hellenistic era, how ancient scholars (especially those in the Alexandrian Museum) studied and used revered texts, and how to determine if a distinctive Greek locution is based on a reading in the translator’s *Vorlage* at variance with the one in MT, or even whether we have sufficient evidence to draw a conclusion in every case.<sup>134</sup>

---

130. Eugene R. Ekblad Jr., *Isaiah’s Servant Poems according to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (CBET 23; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 268.

131. *Ibid.*

132. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, ix.

133. *Ibid.*

134. *Ibid.*

The first chapter, “The Translator of Isaiah,” discussed the translator’s identity. This question relates to how the translator approached his work.<sup>135</sup> Troxel justified this quest with Ziegler’s observation that LXX Isaiah, in contrast to other LXX books, brings with it the particular imprint of the translator. In other words, the personality of the translator has to be taken into account in evaluations of the relation between LXX Isaiah and MT Isaiah. Because the translator often infuses “Isaiah’s oracles with meaning that cannot always be justified linguistically from his source text,” the question of his identity becomes important. It implies that “it is not enough to call him a translator, because he seems to have gone beyond simply offering a translation.”<sup>136</sup>

Troxel advanced that the translator must be seen against the model of the *γραμματικοί* in Alexandria. He rejected van der Kooij’s comparison of LXX Isaiah’s translator with scribes “that produced the *pesharim*,” claiming that “this association with a type of literature found only in *eretz Israel* raises the question in what the [sic] sense the translator was an Alexandrian.”<sup>137</sup> He proposed instead to view the translator as an “Alexandrian.” He found support for this view in the translator’s use of *γραμματικοί* for ספר in LXX Isa 33:18, the only place where *γραμματικός* renders ספר in the LXX. After a brief description of the history of the term *γραμματικοί* in the Hellenistic period and how the latter were expelled from Egypt under Euergetes II after 145 BCE, Troxel argued LXX Isa 33:18 echoes the translator’s contemporaneous history:

In this light, while the translation of ספר by *γραμματικοί* in Isa 33:18 may simply be a register of the translator’s esteem for the grammarians, it seems more likely that his rendering of those verses expressed his dismay at the absence of *γραμματικοί* as pillars of Alexandrian society after 145 BCE. It is difficult to identify a more likely explanation for why, in this passage alone, he elected the use of *γραμματικοί*. In fact, the translation of לקש by οἱ συμβουλευόντες might be equally explicable as reflecting the wholesale dis-patching of many who had remained loyal to Philometer’s widow.<sup>138</sup>

Troxel viewed two aspects of the Isaiah translator that likened him to the *γραμματικοί* in Alexandria. The first is the translator’s linguistic interpretation (chapter 4), especially his use of etymological exegesis.<sup>139</sup> The second is the translator’s recourse to “contextual interpretation” (chapter 5). “Contextual

---

135. Ibid., 1.

136. Ibid., 2.

137. Ibid., 20. See also p. 162.

138. Ibid., 24.

139. Ibid., 107, 132.

interpretation” involves an intertextual interpretation of Isaiah based not only on the immediate or larger context of a given passage but also on the context of the translator’s social-political milieu.<sup>140</sup>

Despite the recognition that the translator interpreted Isaiah in light of his “socio-political milieu,” Troxel turned to a criticism of “contemporization.” The basis for his criticism of “contemporization” was his view of the translator as an Alexandrian as opposed to considering him “*ein Schriftgelehrter*” as van der Kooij had previously advanced. Although Troxel did not make the dichotomy above clear, it becomes apparent in his discussions of “fulfillment-interpretation” in chapters 6–7. According to Troxel, the main difference between his point of view and van der Kooij’s is that, for van der Kooij, the translator “considered himself inspired to interpret the ancient oracles as pre-saging events in his own day.”<sup>141</sup> For Troxel, however, the translator should be taken as someone engaged only in linguistic and contextual interpretation.

The basic problem in how to detect aspects of “contemporization” in LXX Isaiah is that “the issue is defining what sorts of textual markers are sufficient to conclude that the translator deliberately alluded to events in his world as the ‘true’ referent of the prophet’s oracle.”<sup>142</sup> A comparison with the *pesharim* proves inadequate:

The problem of comparing the supposed *Erfüllungsinterpretation* of the translator with the *pesharim* is that the latter are explicit in their alignment of the text with contemporaneous events, whereas we have to extrapolate from oblique statements in a translation to what the translator might have had in view, which raises the thorny issue of intention. When we are dealing with a work whose substance is derived from its Hebrew exemplar, how can we ascertain what mental process created what we perceive as a historical allusion?<sup>143</sup>

Troxel characterized his approach as “minimalist.” Historical references in the translation can only be postulated if a divergence was not based in the immediate or broader literary contexts. As he put it:

Embracing this principle requires a minimalist approach: only if the translator can be shown to refer deliberately to people, countries, ethnic groups, circumstances, or events by deviating from his *Vorlage* is it legitimate to entertain the possibility that he sought to identify such entities as the “true”

---

140. Ibid., 134.

141. Ibid., 19. See also p. 3.

142. Ibid., 162.

143. Ibid.

referents of his Hebrew exemplar. More stringently, it must be shown that the translator did not arrive at a rendering by reasoning from the immediate or broader literary contexts, but that he fashioned it with an eye to circumstances or events in his day.<sup>144</sup>

It is important to register here scholars' responses to Troxel's claims. The most detailed replies came from Albert Pietersma and van der Kooij. In his "A Panel Presentation on Ronald Troxel's *LXX-Isaiah*," Pietersma addressed, among other things, Troxel's interpretation of his crucial LXX Isa 33:18. Pietersma considered Troxel's reading of that passage "a good example of what I deem to be undisciplined interpretation of a translated text."<sup>145</sup> His main criticisms were threefold. First, he argued that Troxel completely ignored the context of Isa 33:18. He did not address the relation between verses 18–19 with 17 and 20: "how does the negativity of vv. 18–19 relate to the positive attitude expressed in vv. 17 and 20?"<sup>146</sup> Pietersma further argued, quoting Troxel's own words, that

it is difficult to see 'how the translator went about forming it [the passage] into a literary unity—unless one take Isa 33:18 in complete isolation from its immediate context. And, for some reason, that is precisely what Troxel does, while at the same time making the entire book of LXX-Isaiah its new context.<sup>147</sup>

Second, he further pointed out that Troxel based his interpretation of LXX Isa 33:18 on "*circumstantial* evidence."<sup>148</sup> By "*circumstantial* evidence," he meant Troxel's reading his view of οἱ γραμματικοί as the literati at the Alexandrian museum into the text. For Pietersma, the evidence of the γραμματικοί in the Alexandrian museum is irrelevant because translation was not among the "various genres of Greek literature" studied at the Museum. As Troxel accepted that LXX Isaiah is a translation, his use of the evidence from the Alexandrian museum is unsuitable for LXX Isaiah's study.<sup>149</sup>

And, third, Pietersma accused Troxel's treatment of LXX Isa 33:18 of being "contradictory" and, echoing Troxel's words, "undisciplined." In arguing that οἱ γραμματικοί reflects events around 145 BCE when the literati of the Museum were expelled from Alexandria, Troxel used contemporization, an

144. Ibid., 164. See also pp. 166–67.

145. Albert Pietersma, "A Panel Presentation on Ronald Troxel's *LXX-Isaiah*," 2; online: [http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/Troxel'sLXX-Isaiah\(2008\).pdf](http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/Troxel'sLXX-Isaiah(2008).pdf).

146. Ibid., 17.

147. Ibid., 17–18.

148. Ibid., 13 (emphasis original).

149. Ibid., 8.

aspect he had heavily criticized in his book. Consequently, Pietersma opined, “What seems contradictory is that, on the one hand, Troxel questions ‘contemporization’ in LXX-Isaiah, while, on the other hand, he introduces it in grand style. To me this is not disciplined or principled interpretation of a translated text.”<sup>150</sup>

Van der Kooij’s reception of Troxel’s book was cordially mixed as it accepted some aspects while rejecting others. He saw Troxel’s call for seeing the translator as a *γραμματικός* as positive insofar as it takes “the wider cultural context” of LXX Isaiah into account.<sup>151</sup> He additionally pointed out that LXX Isaiah and the *γραμματικοί* practiced what is termed “etymological exegesis,” a similarity that Troxel missed. In a footnote, van der Kooij rejected Troxel’s interpretation of Isa 33:18 “as reflecting the dismay of the translator” in view of the absence of the *γραμματικοί* after 145 BCE as “unlikely in view of the immediate context of LXX Isa 33.”<sup>152</sup> Van der Kooij further noted that “contextual interpretation,” which is one of the aspects Troxel advanced as new in LXX Isaiah studies, is actually “not that new;” other scholars, such as Ziegler, had already discussed it.<sup>153</sup>

In general terms, van der Kooij criticized Troxel’s approach as not detailed enough. In Troxel’s discussion of the phrases “the country above Babylon” and “where the tower was built” (LXX Isa 10:9), van der Kooij felt the need for a more detailed explanation. He deemed inadequate Troxel’s view that the “country above Babylon” was a sufficient translation of “as Karchemish” in MT. Although Troxel rightly detected a link with Gen 11 in the phrase “where the tower was built,” van der Kooij similarly wanted a discussion of the reason for the translator’s use of that phrase in LXX Isa 10:9 in relation to Channe, and not Babel as in Gen 11. Troxel’s insufficient treatment of LXX Isa 10:9 led van der Kooij to conclude that “the text as it stands should be analyzed in more detail” and that “since the motif of ‘tower building’ is found in a number of texts of the time ... it would be more interesting to study the text in a wider perspective.”<sup>154</sup> Van der Kooij applied the same criticism to

---

150. Ibid., 18. See also Joachim L. W. Schaper, review of Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: the Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, *JSOT* 33 (2009), 58. Like Pietersma, Schaper also deemed Troxel’s “associations” as no more “disciplined” than, say, those of Isaac L. Seeligmann.

151. Arie van der Kooij, review of Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, *BIOCS* 42 (2009), 148, 152.

152. Ibid., 148n1.

153. Ibid., 148. In addition to Ziegler, the present historical review shows that Zillesen, Fischer, and Koenig had already gone over the issue of “contextual interpretation.”

154. Ibid., 149.



Troxel's treatment of LXX Isa 10:8.<sup>155</sup> Troxel's test case study of LXX Isa 28 on the level of its literary structure was equally lacking in detail. For van der Kooij, it was "rather global."<sup>156</sup>

Van der Kooij also addressed Troxel's criticism of "fulfillment-interpretation." First, he pointed out that "fulfillment-interpretation" "is not a matter of particular vocabulary and toponyms,"<sup>157</sup> as Troxel insinuated in his full treatment of the phrase ἐν (ταῖς) ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις and toponyms in chapter 6 of his book.

Second, van der Kooij highlighted that the "crucial question" in dealing with "fulfillment-interpretation" is hermeneutical in nature, namely, how the "oracles" of Isaiah "were read and understood by the translator."<sup>158</sup> He deemed as "extremely unlikely" that Isaiah was read as referring to the time of the Assyrians and Babylonians, as our historical-critical method postulates. Instead, the "cultural context of LXX Isaiah" indicates that "ancient prophecies were envisaged as trustworthy predictions ... and that scholars who were authorized to do so applied ancient prophecies, or visions, to their own time."<sup>159</sup> He faulted Troxel for not paying attention to this cultural context and noted that Troxel referred only to the *pesharim*.<sup>160</sup>

Finally, van der Kooij reminded Troxel that a simple discussion of "words or phrases, whether arrived on the basis of a given context or not, are too small a basis for the issue of actualization."<sup>161</sup> Instead, it is important to discuss, first, how the translator produced particular renderings; second, a given chapter must be analyzed from the point of view of its contents, paying attention to every aspect of transformation as well as thematic links with other passages

155. Ibid., 149–50.

156. Ibid., 150. Troxel seemed to be aware that his treatment of LXX Isa 28 was not as detailed as it should have been. Note his concluding statement (*LXX-Isaiah*, 286): "even if a full treatment of each verse in this unit might identify additional nuances" (emphasis added).

157. Van der Kooij, review of Ronald L. Troxel, 150.

158. Ibid.

159. Ibid., 151.

160. Ibid. As our review thus far has shown, Troxel failed to note that van der Kooij compared LXX Isaiah not only with the *pesharim*, as Troxel suggested in his book, but with Jewish and non-Jewish sources from inside and outside Palestine. See van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 60–65; idem, *Oracle*, 88–94, and, most recently, idem, "The Old Greek of Isaiah and Other Prophecies Published in Ptolemaic Egypt," in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse. 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.–27.7.2008* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer; WUNT 1/252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 72–84.

161. Ibid.

in LXX Isaiah. Third, the question of actualization can only be addressed after the first two aspects are taken into account.<sup>162</sup>

As it can be seen from the review thus far, a shift from the translator's *Vorlage* to the translator himself has occurred in the study of LXX Isaiah. Scholars disagree, however, on the most fitting way to approach it and how to explain its divergences from MT. This disagreement forms a good background for the discussion that follows.

### 1.2. PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS

That the expression “every translation is an interpretation” is commonplace cannot be denied. James Barr, however, has pointed out “that in the context of ancient biblical translation, this remark is a highly misleading truism.” He argued that the “process of translation” “may involve” two different types of interpretation, “so different as hardly to deserve to be called by the same name.” Whereas the first type of interpretation is a “basic/semantic comprehension of the meaning of the text,” the other “lies on a higher level” as “it begins only after these basic linguistic elements have been identified.”<sup>163</sup> The present work uses the word “interpretation” in its “higher level” denotation.

In contradistinction to previous works,<sup>164</sup> the term “interpretation” deliberately precedes “translation” in the title of the present monograph; the present work's hypothesis is that interpretation on a “higher level” precedes the process of translation. The theory is that the translator of Isaiah was not only familiar with the contents of Isaiah but also had an understanding—on a higher level—of the book he was about to translate before he started his translation. Although it is true that interpretation on a higher level logically presupposes lower-level reading, it is not clear that the translator started the process of translation based only on his understanding on a basic level. The clue for my hypothesis comes from previous research on LXX Isaiah that has demonstrated a certain coherence of thought and themes found throughout the translation. For instance, in his influential work, Ziegler claimed that the translator of Isaiah “scheint überhaupt sein Buch sehr gut dem Inhalte nach

162. Ibid., 152.

163. James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (MSU 15; NAWG 11; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 290–91.

164. See, for example, David A. Baer, *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66* (JSOTSup 318; The Hebrew Bible and Its Versions 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001); Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*.

im Gedächtnis gehabt zu haben.”<sup>165</sup> Interestingly, the basis for Ziegler’s claim is his observation that many renditions in the translation are clarified in the light of similar concepts found in the translator’s *Vorlage*.<sup>166</sup> Similarly, in his study of LXX Isa 25:1–5 in its own right, Coste argued that the translator had an interpretative strategy in mind before he started his translation.<sup>167</sup>

As such, the present work hypothesizes that the translator, after interpreting on a basic level, acquired an understanding of the passage(s) and book on a higher level before the translation process started. Consequently, interpretation on a higher level not only anteceded but also governed and shaped the process of translation. In order to try to verify the hypothesis above, this study will analyze LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 as a text in its own right or as a product. If it can be shown that the translation as a product has its own ideological coherence, it will become clear that its scribe-translator already had a higher-level interpretation that shaped the process of translation.

The view that the product of a translation shaped its process is not new to the fields of translation and LXX Isaiah studies. Gideon Toury argued for the interrelatedness of function, process, and product-oriented approaches. Whereas function concerns the position a translation occupies in the culture in which it is or will be embedded, process has to do with “the process through which a translated text is derived from its original.” The text-linguistic makeup of the translation, the relationships which tie it to its source text, and its shifts from that source, constitute the concern of a product-oriented approach. Toury argued that all these three aspects “are not just ‘related’ ... but ... form one complex whole whose constitutive parts are hardly separable from one another for purposes other than methodical.”<sup>168</sup>

Toury explained the relationship between function, product, and process-oriented approaches as follows: “the (prospective) systemic position & function of a translation determines its appropriate surface realization (= textual linguistic make-up),” which in turn “governs the strategies whereby a target text (or parts thereof) is derived from its original, and hence the relationships which hold them together.”<sup>169</sup> For him, to understand “the intricacies of

---

165. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 135. See the discussion of this work on the history of research sketched above.

166. Ibid.: “denn es begegnen viele Wiedergaben, die sich nur auf Grund der Exegese nach sinnverwandten Stellen erklären lassen.”

167. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 51.

168. Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies—and Beyond* (BTL 4; Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1995), 11.

169. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 13. The quotation reproduces the concepts he presents in the format of a chart.

translational phenomena,” it is of paramount importance to study the “interdependencies” between a function, process, and product-oriented approach.<sup>170</sup>

The function of a translation, prospective or not, in a given culture is a “governing factor in the very make-up of the product, in terms of underlying models, linguistic representations, or both.” Even the retaining of certain features of the source text in the target text signals not to their inherent importance but the importance the producer of the target text assigned to them.<sup>171</sup> In turn, the prospective function of the translation together with its linguistic make-up (product) “inevitably also govern the strategies which are resorted to during the production of the text in question, and hence the translation process as such.”<sup>172</sup> Toury’s remarks are highly important for the field of LXX Isaiah studies. The claim that the function and the product of a translation “govern the strategies” which the translator employs in the process of his translation is a good reminder that a proper explanation for the process of LXX Isaiah translation presupposes a firm understanding of it as a product. Because the translation as a product is the only window to the translator’s interpretation (on a higher level) of his *Vorlage*, it seems reasonable to ground explanations for how particular readings arose on the results of the analysis of the translation as a product.

Another aspect needing emphasis here is Toury’s claim that the retaining of certain features from the source text in the target text does not signal their inherent importance but the importance the translator assigned to them. This claim has a paramount implication for the study of what is normally termed “literal” translations in LXX Isaiah. As was seen in the review of the history of research above, some scholars have argued that the translator’s ideology can only be found in his “free renderings.” This minimalist approach seems to presuppose that the translator decided to keep aspects of his source text because

---

170. Ibid., 11. See also Cameron Boyd-Taylor, review of Anneli Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, BIOSCS 42 (2009): 126, who called for a more target-oriented approach to LXX studies, denying that its translators were “determined principally by linguistic facts.”

171. Ibid., 12: “Consequently, translators may be said to operate first and foremost in the interest of the culture into which they are translating, however they conceive of that interest. In fact, the extent to which features of a source text are retained in its translation (or even regarded as even requiring retention, in the first place), which, at first sight, seems to suggest an operation in the interest of the source culture, or even of the source text as such, is also determined on the target side, and according to its own concerns: features are retained, and reconstructed in target-language material, not because they are ‘important’ in any *inherent* sense, but because they are *assigned* importance, from the recipient vantage point” (emphasis original).

172. Ibid., 13.

of their inherent importance. However, it is vital to note that the translator may have retained certain features of his *Vorlage* intact in his translation because of their importance to him, to his intentions, and to his interpretation, on a higher level, of his source text. As such, the claim that the translator's ideology or intentions can only be found in his deviations is highly problematic. As will be argued in the course of this work, both "literal" and "free" renderings taken together should be seen as expressive to the translator's higher-level interpretation of his *Vorlage*.

Some scholars in the field of LXX Isaiah studies have long applied similar concepts in their research. A prime example is Arie van der Kooij's study of LXX Isa 23. He first approached it as a text, which entailed two interrelated aspects: in comparison with MT (source text) and in its own right (target text). This approach is similar to Toury's product-oriented approach. After analyzing LXX Isa 23 in its own right, van der Kooij went on to discuss why LXX Isa 23 was produced the way it was (function), finishing with remarks on how the translator produced his translation (process).<sup>173</sup> Van der Kooij's logic was similar to Toury's: it is only possible to understand the process of a translation after a study of the translation as a product.

The present work stands firmly on that tradition. It will pursue two main questions. First, where should the translator's "higher level" interpretations be found? Should they be found only in his "free" renderings? Or should they be found in a combination of both "free" and "literal" translations?<sup>174</sup> Second, do the "literal" and "free" renderings of the sections that compose LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 cohere with each other?<sup>175</sup> In other words, is the final product of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 to be seen as a meaningful coherent literary unit? Another ancillary question would be whether LXX Isa 24:1–26:6, possibly as a coherent text, could shed light on the translation process of those chapters. Although this question falls outside the scope of the present work, occasionally the issue of the translation process will be addressed.

---

173. Van der Kooij, *Oracle*, 48, 88, 110. For details on this work, see the discussion above.

174. For a discussion of the difficulty implied in the terms "literal" and "free" in relation to LXX studies, see Barr, *Typology*, 279–325 and the more recent contribution by Theo A. W. van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies* (CBET 47; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), *passim*. For a helpful definition of "free" and "literal" translations, see Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 125: "The more a translation unit uses fixed equivalents, the more it is considered literal, and the less that such equivalents are found in it, the freer it is considered."

175. For a discussion of the scope of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6, see discussion below.

What follows is a critique of approaches that limit themselves to the process of the translation without paying attention to the translation as a product. A common characteristic of approaches that start with the process of translation is their atomistic nature. As it will be seen below, with a few exceptions, they usually pay attention to words or phrases and hardly discuss the translation on broader levels, such as verses, paragraphs, chapters, and book. Their working assumption seems to be that translation immediately followed interpretation on its basic level.

### 1.3. PROBLEMATIC ASSUMPTIONS

#### 1.3.1. Low-Level Interpretation to Translation Equals Emergency Solution

Interpretation as an emergency solution assumes the translator did not understand the meaning of his Hebrew *Vorlage*.<sup>176</sup> It is claimed that when faced with a difficult text, the translator panicked and “looked for an emergency exit.”<sup>177</sup> It is equally claimed that most cases judged to be theological exegesis are actually examples of “emergency solutions” the translator employed due to his misunderstandings and guessing.<sup>178</sup>

A text cited as an illustration of the translator’s perplexity in face of a difficult Hebrew text is Isa 9:5(Eng. 6)d: **וְיִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ פֶּלֶא יוֹעֵץ אֱלֹהִים גִּבּוֹר אֲבִיעַד** **וְשֵׁן וְרָשׁ**/καὶ καλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄξω εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας εἰρήνην καὶ ὑγίαιαν αὐτοῖς. It has been claimed that the translator’s interpretation of this passage “is built around a few items that have been analyzed in an incorrect way.”<sup>179</sup> First, the Greek genitival construction *μεγάλης βουλῆς* “is impossible on the basis of the Hebrew” because “Hebrew cannot express a genitive preceding its main word;” second, ἄξω “is based on

176. In the field of LXX Isaiah studies, it is sometimes assumed that the translator’s knowledge of Hebrew was weak under the impression that such an assumption is “generally agreed” among specialists on LXX Isaiah See, e.g., Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 83n57, 84n67. Troxel dismissed van der Kooij’s argument that the translator was trained in reading the Hebrew aloud. With Seeligmann, he argued that the translator’s knowledge of Hebrew was more “a product of theoretical study rather than of living experience” (Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 49). Even if it were true that the translator’s knowledge of Hebrew was more a product of theoretical study, it is hard to see how that would prevent him from learning how to read the Hebrew aloud.

177. Anneli Aejmelaeus, “Levels of Interpretation: Tracing the Trail of the Septuagint Translators,” in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (rev. and expanded ed.; CBET 50; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 310.

178. Ibid., 309.

179. Ibid.

a false analysis of the Hebrew ‘Father’;” that is, the translator analyzed אבִי as אביא “I will cause to come.” Third, עַד was read as a preposition and was translated with ἐπὶ; fourth, singular שָׁר was “turned to plural ‘rulers’” (ἄρχοντας). Fifth, ἄγγελος corresponds to אֵל גִּבּוֹר; and, finally, there is the threefold translation of שְׁלוֹם.<sup>180</sup> This brief analysis led Aejmelaeus to conclude that “the syntactic structure of the Greek text is based on mere guessing. The translator simply panicked and looked for an ‘emergency exit.’”<sup>181</sup>

However, it is maintained that “the difficulty of the source and the ignorance of the translator give way to contemporary theological or ideological convictions.” In this case, the ideology is the wish that the rulers of all nations will receive peace. The case of Isa 9:5 is not to be considered an interpretation but as a rewriting of the source text, a rewriting that still gives rise to the translator’s ideology.<sup>182</sup>

The principle underlying the approach exemplified is that *if it looks like a mistake, then it must have been a mistake*. The belief is that explanations as mistakes are simpler and, therefore, should receive the priority. On the contrary, ideological reasons should not be seen as key. Note the following circular reasoning: “It is here as important as ever to adhere to the old rule that the simplest adequate explanation should be given precedence over more complicated ones. A deliberate change of the meaning out of an ideological motivation seems to me in many cases to be the more complicated explanation.”<sup>183</sup>

The question is, of course, whether explanations from the point of view of “translation style” are in fact the simplest, given Aejmelaeus’s recognition that all LXX translators “had a theological or religious motivation for their work.”<sup>184</sup>

Aejmelaeus’s explanations of Isa 9:5 as the result of guessing give an important opportunity to discuss approaches that focus solely on “translation style.” Such an approach is highly limited. First, it is usually atomistic in that it pays attention to single words or phrases at the expense of the broader literary context. For instance, Aejmelaeus offers no comments on the translator’s use of the conjunction γάρ and on the transition to divine speech that ἐγώ

---

180. Ibid.

181. Ibid., 309–10.

182. Ibid., 310. Similarly, Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 96, also maintained that the translator betrayed his theology in mistaken interpretations due to his lack of understanding of the Hebrew.

183. Aejmelaeus, “Levels of Interpretation,” 312.

184. Anneli Aejmelaeus, “What We Talk about when We Talk about Translation Technique,” in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*, 218. See also Boyd-Taylor’s critical remarks in a review of Anneli Aejmelaeus, 125.



signals.<sup>185</sup> No attention is devoted to the role words and phrases play in their own literary context.

Second, the approach paradoxically lacks in detailed analysis and it can be characterized as methodologically one-sided. By not discussing the function of ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄξω, Aejmelaesus's approach missed an important clue to understanding the translator's interpretation.<sup>186</sup> Aejmelaesus's approach, besides focusing solely on the translation process without paying attention to the translation as a product, takes for granted that the translation should be "literal." The definition of "literal" is highly problematic. Does "literal" equate to the modern exegete's interpretation of the Hebrew? Is it possible that the translator's divergent interpretations could also be seen as "literal"—at least from his perspective?

And, third, the approach can also be characterized as anachronistic. The question is how to determine whether the translator's reading of Isa 9:5 was the result of a mistake or not. Most importantly, if one wants to call it a mistake, then the question would be: mistake in whose eyes? Perhaps, it would be in the eyes of the modern exegete, who reads Isa 9:5 differently from the translator. But could one still say that the translator made a mistake? And how should one determine whether a particular reading is a mistake? The proposal of this work is that a reading can only be deemed a "mistake" if it can be determined that it does not fit in its own literary context in the Greek. If it can, then the likelihood is that it was not a mistake.

### 1.3.2. Higher-Level Interpretation Found Only in Free Translations

A common assumption among some specialists is that the translator's ideology is only found in his "free" renderings. Although Seeligmann had argued that the translator's religious notions can be found in literal and free renderings as "both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator

---

185. For a recent and helpful discussion of these issues, see Ronald L. Troxel, "BOYAH and BOYAEYEIN in LXX Isaiah," in *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 160; Abi T. Ngunga, *Messianism in the Old Greek of Isaiah: An Intertextual Analysis* (FRLANT 245; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 89–93.

186. For a more fruitful discussion of Isa 9:6, see Arie van der Kooij, "Wie heißt der Messias? Zu Jes 9,5 in den alten griechischen Versionen," in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik; Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, and Christoph Levin; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 157–63; Robert Hanhart, *Studien zur Septuaginta und zum hellenistischen Judentum* (ed. Reinhard G. Kratz; FAT 24; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 95–133.



In Troxel's monograph, one gets the impression that "literal" equals "linguistic interpretation," whereas "free" stands for "exegetical, contextual interpretation." However, a sharp distinction between "linguistic" and "exegetical" interpretations is unsustainable. For instance, Troxel discussed the translator's interpretation of passages "in the light of theologoumena" elsewhere in the book under the heading "linguistic interpretation in LXX-Isaiah."<sup>192</sup> This is, however, hardly a matter of "linguistic interpretation." For example, Troxel pointed to the translator's equalization of *δόξα* with salvation—as is clear from LXX Isa 40:5: *ידדו וראו יהוה כבוד ונגלה* και *ὑψήσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου* και *ὑψεται* *πάντα σὰρξ* τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ.<sup>193</sup> The difficulty of

193. Ibid., 130.

terming the translator's use of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  and salvation as part of "linguistic" interpretation is clearly seen in Troxel's conclusion that "the translator's exploitation of the themes of  $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$  and salvation are good examples of 'theological exegesis.'" <sup>194</sup> Even if it is true that those themes are "essential elements of the book of the translator," <sup>195</sup> the translator's decision to employ them in his rendition of certain passages cannot be a matter of linguistics only. Rather, the translator had to make a deliberate and intentional decision to introduce those themes in a particular passage, in a move that goes far beyond simply "linguistic" interpretation.

Another problem with the claim that the translator's exegesis can only be found in his "free" translations is that it tends to dissect the very text the translator produced as a unit. As seen above, Troxel offered a valuable discussion of the translator's use of prepositions "to clarify relationships between clauses." <sup>196</sup> The translator's linking of clauses through conjunctions implies that he aimed at producing a well-knit text, which was composed of "free" and "literal" translations. If the translator considered that his "free" renderings went along with his more "literal" ones, it is a mistake to assume that his exegesis is only found in "free" renderings. Moreover, as discussed above, Toury has pointed out that the retaining of certain features of the source text in the target text points not to their intrinsic importance but to the significance the translator assigned to them. As I will argue, the translator's exegesis is found in the final form of the text he produced, which happens to include both "free" and "literal" translations.

Troxel's claim that the translator's ideology can only be found in "free" renderings to the exclusion of "literal" ones raises an important question: Is the translator's ideology to be found only in "free" renderings or can they also be found in "literal" translations? More specifically, could the translator's juxtaposition of "free" and "literal" translations reflect his ideology?

### 1.3.3. Higher-Level Interpretations and Low-Level Ones Do Not Cohere

As was mentioned above, although Seeligmann viewed "free translations" as important as "literal renditions" for the reconstruction of the translator's theology, <sup>197</sup> he also claimed that the translator's own views or historical allusions can be found in free renderings. And not only in "free renderings" in

---

194. Ibid., 131–32.

195. Ibid., 132.

196. Ibid., 91.

197. Seeligmann, *The The Septuagint Version*, 95: "This implies that, for such a cross-section, passages that were translated literally in a given book of the Septuagint, are of equal

general but “especially in those places where these insertions appear to constitute an element alien to the main context.”<sup>198</sup> He did not believe “free renderings” cohered with the translator’s more “literal translations:” “If we look at the mentality behind the inconsistencies in this light, we shall ... feel skeptical towards the probability of their being particularly ingenious and particularly purposeful efforts to discover logical connexions in any chapter or part of a chapter in our Septuagint-text.”<sup>199</sup>

Different from Seeligmann, Coste showed that the “free renderings” of LXX Isa 25:1–5 cohered well with its “literal translations.” After discussing the LXX of Isa 25:1–5 in comparison with MT,<sup>200</sup> Coste concluded that it showed itself, as a translational text, “comme un échec presque complet.” Contrarily, when analyzed as a literary unit in its own right, LXX Isa 25:1–5 is “une composition ordonnée et cohérent.”<sup>201</sup> Coste further concluded that LXX Isa 25:1–5, as a literary and conceptual text, shows that an active interpretive plan was already at work even before its translation had started. Finally, Coste argued that this interpretive plan reflected the translator’s personal piety and faith.<sup>202</sup> Das Neves and van der Kooij reached similar conclusions in their studies of LXX Isa 24; 23 respectively.<sup>203</sup>

The divergence of opinions as to whether LXX Isaiah’s “free” translations cohere with its “literal” renditions offers an excellent opportunity to ask the question: do the “free” translations in LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 cohere with its “literal” ones? In other words, does LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 make any sense without recourse to its Hebrew *Vorlage*? One specialist remarked: “Nevertheless, that translator [LXX Isaiah] seems to have viewed his task differently than those of the Torah. While he often follows their more literal tendencies, he frequently also stands closer to the style of translation we find in Proverbs and Job. The question is how to account for this peculiar mix.”<sup>204</sup> In my view, the question is not so much to account for how “literal” and “free” renderings

---

importance as free paraphrases: both represent fragments of the religious notions of the translator concerned.”

198. Ibid., 41.

199. Ibid. See also Barr, *Typology*, 281: “the tendency of many early translators was ... to combine the two approaches [literal and free] in a quite inconsequential way.”

200. Coste, “Le texte grec” 37–45.

201. Ibid., 50.

202. Ibid., 51.

203. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 265; van der Kooij, *Oracle*, 87. On p. 43, das Neves claimed that the differences between the Hebrew and the Greek find their origin in the “mentalidade teológica do nosso tradutor.” I.e., LXX Isaiah is more an interpretation than a translation.

204. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 75.

came to be but whether those two types of translations make sense in their own literary contexts.

#### 1.3.4. Contextual Interpretation versus Interpretation on a Higher Level

In his criticisms of “fulfillment-interpretation,” Troxel postulated a principle to detect whether a particular divergence in the Greek reflects the translator’s contemporaneous history or not. For him, historical references in LXX Isaiah can only be found if a divergence was not based in the immediate or broader literary contexts. As he put it:

Embracing this principle requires a minimalist approach: only if the translator can be shown to refer deliberately to people, countries, ethnic groups, circumstances, or events by deviating from his *Vorlage* is it legitimate to entertain the possibility that he sought to identify such entities as the “true” referents of his Hebrew exemplar. More stringently, it must be shown that the translator did not arrive at a rendering by reasoning from the immediate or broader literary contexts, but that he fashioned it with an eye to circumstances or events in his day.<sup>205</sup>

The principle seems to be based on the assumption that the translator, when faced with a difficult Hebrew text, resorts to phraseology from elsewhere:

Additionally, the fact that deviations from the MT recur in several passages may mean nothing more than that the translator followed similar paths in trying to rescue verses he found inscrutable, as evidenced by “stop-gap” words like ἡττᾶσθαι.<sup>206</sup>

The problem with this approach is its assumption that the translator resorted to words or phraseology from elsewhere in his *Vorlage* due to their inherent importance. However, Toury has remarked that a translator retains aspects of his source text because of the importance he assigned to them.<sup>207</sup> In this light, it is important to ask the question as to why the translator of Isaiah decided to use words or phraseology from elsewhere for his translation of certain passages. Was it because of their inherent importance or because of the importance he assigned to them? If the second option is correct, then it will become clear that even the use of words or phraseology from elsewhere in the *Vorlage*

---

<sup>205</sup> Ibid., 164. See also pp. 166–67.

<sup>206</sup> Ibid., 166.

<sup>207</sup> See the discussion above and Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 12–13.

may betray the translator's ideology simply because he found them important for his higher level interpretation of his source text.

Furthermore, the fact that a reading may be based on the immediate or broader context does not exclude the issue of intention. In this sense, van der Kooij's critique of Troxel is relevant. He reminded Troxel that a simple discussion of "words or phrases, whether arrived on the basis of a given context or not, are too small a basis for the issue of actualization."<sup>208</sup> I would add they are equally too narrow for detecting interpretation on a higher level.

#### 1.4. METHODOLOGY

In the attempt to detect higher-level interpretation in the translation of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6, the present study will approach it from two interrelated perspectives. First, part 1 will compare LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 with MT. The focus lies in describing, not evaluating, the translator's *Übersetzungsweise*.<sup>209</sup> One important aspect is the discovery of unusual lexical choices. Unusual is defined here in the light of the Isaiah translator's profile. The question is: why did the translator choose a particular Greek term for his rendition of a certain Hebrew word?<sup>210</sup> Put differently, when faced with a choice between two or more Greek lexemes for a single Hebrew term, what led the translator to select one lexeme over the other? While part 1 concerns the translator's lexical choices, part 2 attempts to ascertain whether those lexical choices make sense in their own literary contexts.

Part 1 will not attempt to judge whether the translator's *Vorlage* was identical to unvocalized MT or not. It rather takes MT tentatively as the likely *Vorlage* behind the Greek. Dries de Crom pointed out the similarity between LXX and Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) in relation to the provisional status of the source-text in translation studies: "both DTS and translation technique work with *assumed* source texts, meaning that the nature and extent of ST [source text]-TT [target text] relations are not given but have to be discovered during textual study." Whereas the provisional status of the source text is an axiomatic formulation in DTS, de Crom indicated that in LXX studies that provisional status is "a practical consequence of the textual uncertainty of both ST and TT."<sup>211</sup> As such, unpunctuated MT will be tentatively taken as the likely

208. Van der Kooij, review of Ronald L. Troxel, 151.

209. For the study of "translation style" as descriptive, see van der Kooij, *Oracle*, 16. For a similar position in relation to LXX studies outside LXX Isaiah, see Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*, 205–6.

210. Olley, "Righteousness," 11.

211. Dries de Crom, "The LXX Text of Canticles: a Descriptive Study in Hebrew-

source text of LXX Isaiah. When there is a divergence between the Qumran Isaiah scrolls and MT, part 1 will discuss that divergence. The assumption is that one cannot make decisions concerning LXX Isaiah's *Vorlage* without understanding its profile. One can only make textual decisions based on a translation after becoming acquainted with its style. For that reason, part 2 will, when necessary, discuss the issue of the translator's *Vorlage*.

Second, part 2 will analyze LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 as a text in its own right. Two aspects will be the focus here: First, to what extent do “free” renderings found in the composing sections of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 cohere with its “literal” translations? Can LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 be seen as a coherent text? In other words, “To what extent can one make sense of the Greek text without recourse to the Hebrew?”<sup>212</sup> The second aspect concerns the Greek as a text in its own right: how does LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 compare ideologically with MT? As discussed above, some scholars claim the translator's ideology can only be found in “free” renderings. While it is true that one must start with “free” translations, it will be argued in the course of this work that the translator's ideology, in the sense of how he interpreted the Hebrew on a higher level, is to be found in the final product of his translation. This final product is composed of “free” and “literal” renderings.

This two-step, interrelated approach, consisting of a comparison between the Greek text with MT and the Greek text in its own right is steeped in the methodology that van der Kooij has developed in his approach to LXX Isaiah.<sup>213</sup> One of the advantages of his approach is to highlight differences between the Greek and MT (step 1) in order to pursue the question as to whether those differences cohere in the context of the Greek text in its own right (step 2). It should also be noted that step 1 is not an explanation for the process of the translation; such an explanation follows step 2. While some will object that this separation produces a fragmentary examination of the Greek and contradicts Toury's approach discussed above, it should be noted that even Toury recognizes the need for such an approach when he says that the function, process, and product-oriented approach “are not just ‘related’ ... but ... form one complex whole whose constitutive parts are hardly separable from one another *for purposes other than methodical*.”<sup>214</sup>

In order to answer the main questions of the present research, the analysis of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 in part 2 will focus on the following aspects: (1) the

---

Greek Translation” (PhD diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven OE Literatuurwetenschap: Tekst en Interpretatie, 2009), xxxix.

212. Ibid., xxxvii.

213. For a discussion of van der Kooij's approach to LXX Isaiah, see above.

214. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 13 (emphasis added).

translator's lexical choices; (2) issues of delimitation of units and subunits in Isa 24:1–26:6; (3) matters of syntax and style such as the use of particles and conjunctions and (4) the identification of similar themes found in Isa 24:1–26:6. On occasion, the relation of such themes to the rest of LXX Isaiah will also be addressed.

### 1.5. CONTRIBUTION

LXX Isaiah's research history is a basic attempt to provide an explanation for the divergences between the Hebrew and the Greek. As the historical overview above shows, scholars have proposed many varied reasons for LXX Isaiah's departures from the Hebrew. A different Hebrew *Vorlage*, translator's deficient knowledge of Hebrew, poor orthographic quality of the translator's Hebrew manuscript, translator's reading errors of similar Hebrew consonants, changes in the transmission of LXX Isaiah, the translator's theology and bent for fulfillment-interpretation, linguistic necessity of the target language, and so on, were all advanced as possible candidates to account for the differences between the translation and its source text. Given the number of divergent opinions, there is clearly a need for a firmer and more helpful methodological meter from which to judge a particular divergence in LXX Isaiah.

One important parameter will be whether the literary sections composing LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 can be seen as a coherent text. Coherence will provide a firmer framework to evaluate the nature of LXX Isaiah's divergences from the Hebrew. The presence of coherence in a given passage in the Greek will suggest that the translator intentionally read his *Vorlage* in a different way from, say, Aquila and our modern interpretation of the Hebrew. The presence of coherence would also indicate the translator had an interpretation on a higher level in mind before he even started his translation. Coherence would also open the doors to a more fruitful search for the discovery of the translator's milieu in his translation. Similarly, the lack of coherence would suggest that LXX Isaiah's divergences from the Hebrew have an accidental nature. As such, explanations like translator's errors, different *Vorlage*, and the like would seem more convincing.

The search for LXX Isaiah's coherence presupposes a methodological approach that focuses not only on describing the process of the translation, but also on the translation as a product. In fact, the methodological contribution of the present work is to call for a study of the Greek in its own right before delving into discussions of how the translator went about producing his translation. It will be argued that the process of the translator can be properly assessed only after the acquisition of a solid understanding of the translation as a product.

As is clear from the historical overview above, scholars have made considerable progress in studying LXX Isaiah as a text in its own right in opposition to studying it in relation to its Hebrew *Vorlage* (textual criticism) or simply as a translation. However, there still remains much to be done in the study of LXX Isaiah as a document in and of itself. Not too long ago, scholars complained about the lack of work on LXX Isaiah in its own right: “there have, of course, been many large strides forward in the study of the LXX, but the LXX remains valuable to most scholars primarily as a witness to its *Vorlage*, and not as a document in and of itself.”<sup>215</sup> This statement remains true today. In taking LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 as a text in its own right and commenting on it in detail, the present work hopes to be a step forward in filling this gap.

#### 1.6. SCOPE

One commentator has correctly remarked on MT Isa 24–27 that “few sections within the book of Isaiah have called forth such a wide measure of scholarly disagreement on their analysis and interpretation as have these four chapters.” One of the major problems of this literary section is the issue of whether it has any structural coherence. Basically, scholars have debated the issue of how to relate what appears to be “eschatological prophecy” (Isa 24:1–23; 26:6–27:13) with “liturgical songs” (Isa 25:1–5; 26:1–6).<sup>216</sup> The lack of agreement on the coherence of MT Isa 24–27 offers an interesting opportunity to see what became of those chapters in LXX Isa 24–27.

As will be seen in the course of this work, LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 forms a literary unit that revolves around the theme of “cities” and the “ungodly” (24:10, 12; 25:2–3; 26:1, 5–6). There is a contrast between the “fortified cities” (πόλεις ὀχυράς in 25:2; 26:5) and the “fortified city” (πόλις ὀχυρά in 26:1). In addition, there is a reference to the “city of the ungodly” (τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλις in 25:2b), the “cities of the wronged men” (πόλεις ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων in 25:3), and to “every city/cities” (πᾶσα πόλις/πόλεις in 24:10, 12).<sup>217</sup> Even though Isa 27:3

215. Stanley E. Porter and Brook W. R. Pearson, “Isaiah through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans; VTSup 70/2; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 531.

216. Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 171–72.

217. For a discussion of the identity of these cities, cf. Arie van der Kooij, “The Cities of Isaiah 24–27 According to the Vulgate, Targum and the Septuagint,” in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27: The Isaiah Workshop—De Jesaja Werkplaats* (ed. Hendrik Jan Bosman, et al.; *OtSt* 43; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 191–96; idem, “Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions,” in *As Those Who Are Taught: The Interpretation of Isaiah*



mentions a “strong, besieged city” (πόλις ἰσχυρά πόλις πολιορκουμένη), Isa 27 has been left out of consideration for practical reasons; the problems Isa 27 presents both in the Hebrew and in the Greek would deserve a monograph dedicated solely to it. The use of πόλεις ὀχυράς in LXX Isa 26:5–6 form a nice *inclusio* around the theme of “cities” that had started in LXX Isa 24:10, 12. As such, the present work will focus on LXX Isa 24:1–26:6.

Another reason for choosing LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 as the object of the present inquiry is the lack of attention which previous works on these chapters have devoted to the theme of cities and their relation to the (un)godly. As seen in the history of research above, neither Liebmann’s text-critical interest in LXX Isa 24–27 nor Coste’s or das Neves’s theological approach have dealt with the cities and (un)godly motif in LXX Isa 24:1–26:6. Apart from a couple of brief articles on the cities,<sup>218</sup> there are no other systematic studies of these important themes in LXX Isa 24:1–26:6. The present study hopes to fill that gap.

Finally, a deeper understanding of how the Isaiah translator read Hebrew Isa 24:1–26:6 is important for modern interpreters of MT. As is well-known, MT Isa 24–27 has received considerable attention in the past hundred years.<sup>219</sup> In contrast, little attention has been devoted to LXX Isa 24–27. With the exception of Liebmann’s study of its translation technique, Coste’s treatment of LXX Isa 25:1–5 and das Neves’s discussion of Isa 24, LXX Isa 24–27 remains unstudied in a detailed way. It is important for those working on Hebrew Isa 24–27 to know how one of its first interpreters, the Greek translator of Isaiah, read it. It is possible that modern students may gain some light from LXX Isaiah in solving difficult problems in the interpretation of the Hebrew.<sup>220</sup> The present study of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 hopes to give the student of the Hebrew a thorough understanding of how that text was first interpreted in the second century BCE.

---

from the LXX to the SBL (ed. Claire Matthews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull; SBLSymS 27; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 62–66.

218. Van der Kooij, “The Cities of Isaiah 24–27,” 191–96; idem, “Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah,” 62–66.

219. For recent studies on Isa 24–27, see e.g., Reinhard Scholl, *Die Elenden in Gottes Thronrat: Stilistisch-kompositorische Untersuchungen zu Jesaja 24–27* (BZAW 274; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000); Brian Doyle, *The Apocalypse of Isaiah Metaphorically Speaking: A Study of the Use, Function and Significance of Metaphors in Isaiah 24–27* (BETL 151; Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2000); J. Todd Hibbard, *Intertextuality in Isaiah 24–27: The Reuse and Evocation of Earlier Texts and Traditions* (FAT 2/16; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

220. For an example of an attempt to gain some light from the LXX for the interpretation of MT Isa 24:14–16, cf. Wilson de Angelo Cunha, “A Brief Discussion of MT Isaiah 24,14–16,” *Bib* 90 (2009): 530–44.



## PART 1: MT AND LXX ISAIAH COMPARED

Part 1 will focus on a comparison between MT and LXX Isa 24:1–26:6.<sup>221</sup> It will note agreements and divergences between MT and LXX. It will also discuss previous explanations for differences found in the Greek text. With the exception of a few cases, there is no attempt to explain the process behind the translation; an explanation is occasionally offered in part 2, but not in a systematic way. Part 1 endeavors to raise questions about the translator's lexical choices, highlight different reading tradition(s) from MT, and point to previous scholarly explanations of divergences as mistakes or as due to a different *Vorlage*. Part 1 is divided into three main chapters: LXX Isa 24 (chapter 2), LXX Isa 25 (chapter 3), and LXX Isa 26:1–6 (chapter 4). The comparison proceeds on a verse-by-verse basis. Each section presents MT with my own critical translation, then the LXX, followed by English (*NETS*) and German (LXX.D) renditions. The latter two are offered for the sake of clarity. The German translation nicely italicizes the LXX's divergencies from MT so that the reader can immediately identify them. My critical translation of the Greek text is reserved for part 2, where a discussion of other translations is carried out.

---

221. Ziegler's critical edition is the standard text used in the present work. See Joseph Ziegler, *Isaias* (3rd ed.; Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983). At times, there is a discussion of other critical editions as well (cf. comments on Isa 25:5 in §3).



# ISAIAH 24:1–23: A COMPARISON

24:1

MT: הנה יהוה בוקק הארץ ובולקה ועוה פניה והפיץ ישיביה

Translation: “Soon, Yahweh is about<sup>1</sup> to lay waste<sup>2</sup> the earth and to devastate it and to distress its face and to scatter its inhabitants.”

LXX: ἰδοὺ κύριος καταφθείρει τὴν οἰκουμένην καὶ ἐρημώσει αὐτὴν καὶ ἀνακαλύψει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς καὶ διασπερεῖ τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν αὐτῇ

NETS: “Look, the Lord is ruining the world and will make it desolate, and he will uncover its surface and scatter those who dwell in it.”

LXX.D: “Siehe, der Herr zerstört die bewohnte Welt bis auf den Grund und wird sie zur Einöde machen und ihr Antlitz *bloßlegen* und die zerstreuen, die in ihr wohnen.”

The phrase ἰδοὺ κύριος καταφθείρει τὴν οἰκουμένην relates to הנה יהוה בוקק הארץ. It has been suggested that the lexeme ἐρημώω, rather than καταφθείρω,

---

1. George B. Gray (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah 1–27* [ICC 18; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912], 408) correctly argued that the participle attached to the particle הנה denotes the immediate future. See also *IBHS*, §37.6f; John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1–39* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 444. Hendrick Jan Bosman and Harm W. M. van Grol’s translation (“Annotated Translation of Isaiah 24–27,” in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27: The Isaiah Workshop—De Jesaja Werkplaats* [ed. Hendrik Jan Bosman et al.; OtSt 43; Leiden: Brill, 2000], 4) rightly expresses the immediate future idea of Isa 24:1a as “YHWH is about to.” For syntactical constructions of the הנה + participle type in Isaiah, see Isa 3:1; 10:33; 22:17; 26:21; 39:6.

2. *HALOT*, 1:150.

translates בִּקֵּק here.<sup>3</sup> This proposal must be rejected due to a lack of evidence for the equivalence ἐρημόω/בִּקֵּק in the LXX. Besides, the use of the cognates φθορά/φθείρω for בִּקֵּק [2x] (cf. Isa 24:3) indicates that καταφθείρω is linked to בִּקֵּק in 24:1.<sup>4</sup> Excepting Isa 24:1, 3, בִּקֵּק appears only once more in Isaiah, at 19:3, where it was translated with ταρασσώ “to stir, set in motion.” In the rest of the LXX, σφάζω “to slaughter” (Jer 19:7), λυμαίνομαι “to cause or inflict serious harm and damage to” (Jer 51:2 [LXX 28:2]), and ἐκτινάσσω “to shake out” (Nah 2:3[2x]) all translate בִּקֵּק. On the other hand, καταφθείρω is used in LXX Isaiah as a translation of חָבַל “to destroy” in Isa 10:27; 13:5; 32:7. Both the equivalence καταφθείρω/חָבַל and the variety of lexemes used for בִּקֵּק in both LXX Isaiah and LXX as a whole suggest the translator’s pick of καταφθείρω is striking (see §5.1 in the present study).

The use of the lexeme οἰκουμένη for אֶרֶץ deserves comment. Excluding Ps 72:8, this equivalence occurs almost solely in LXX Isaiah (e.g., Isa 10:23; 13:5, 9; 14:26; 23:17; 24:1; 37:16, 18).<sup>5</sup> Besides, γῆ “land” is the usual rendition of אֶרֶץ in LXX Isaiah (e.g., 24:3, 4, 5, 6). Contrarily, οἰκουμένη frequently stands for תִּבְלָה in both LXX Isaiah (e.g., Isa 13:11; 14:17; 24:4; 27:6; 34:1) and the rest of the LXX. The rarity of the pair οἰκουμένη/אֶרֶץ begs the question as to why the translator decided to employ οἰκουμένη in Isa 24:1.<sup>6</sup> It has been argued that the translator used γῆ/οἰκουμένη in Isa 24–27 indiscriminately.<sup>7</sup> Whether that was the case or not will be discussed further in part 2, below.

The sentence καὶ ἐρημώσει αὐτήν “and he will lay it waste” translates וְבוֹלֵקָה “and he will destroy it.” The verb בִּלֵּק appears only here and as a substantivized participle in Nah 2:11. The equivalence ἐρημόω/בִּלֵּק occurs nowhere else.<sup>8</sup> In LXX Isaiah, the lexeme ἐρημόω or cognates render a number of Hebrew terms:

3. J. C. M. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías (Cap. 24 de Isaías)* (Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973), 64.

4. HRCS, 2:747; Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint* (Peeters: Louvain, 2010), 66.

5. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 64. He inadvertently included Prov 8:31 as another example of the equivalence οἰκουμένη/אֶרֶץ. However, Prov 8:31 reads תִּבְלָה instead of אֶרֶץ.

6. In contrast to MT/4QIsa<sup>c</sup>, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> reads אֲדָמָה instead of אֶרֶץ. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>’s divergent reading has, however, no bearing on whether οἰκουμένη reflects a *Vorlage* that read אֲדָמָה; οἰκουμένη never renders אֲדָמָה in the LXX. In addition, the remaining textual witnesses all support MT. See Targ. אֲרַעָא, Pesh. ܐܪܥܐ, and Vulg. *terram*.

7. Ernst Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaja 24–27,” *ZAW* 22 (1902): 40.

8. Pesh. used the *paʿel* of ܐܠܟܐ “to assail severely, strike in pieces” (cf. Jessie Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* [ALR; London: Clarendon, 1896; repr., Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 1999], 181). The Vulg. has *nudare* “to lay bare.” Targ. is highly interpretive: וּמְסַר לָהּ לְסָנְאָה “and he will hand it over to the adversary.” All Aramaic quotations

חרב “to dry up” (e.g., Isa 34:10; 37:18; 44:27; 49:17; 51:10; 60:12), שמים “to be desolate” or cognates (e.g., Isa 1:7; 33:8; 54:3), חרם “to destroy” (e.g., Isa 11:15), שבר “to break” (e.g., Isa 24:10), and שאה “to lie desolate” (e.g., Isa 6:11). Given the rarity of the verb בלק in MT, the question as to why the translator picked ἐρημόω here must be asked; see part 2 §5.1, below.

Καὶ ἀνακαλύψει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς renders פניה ועוה. The equivalence ἀνακαλύπτω “to uncover”/עוה “to do wrong” occurs only here. Scholars have argued that either the translator misread עוה as ערה “to uncover” due to the similarity of the consonants ו/ר or that his *Vorlage* already contained ערה.<sup>9</sup> Another scholar pointed out that the translator used ἀνακαλύπτω because of the reference to “face” in the Hebrew.<sup>10</sup> The translator seemed to know עוה as “to do wrong” because he used ἀδιδέω “to do wrong” to translate it in Isa 21:3 (see also 2 Sam 19:20; 2 Chron 6:37; Est 1:16; Jer 3:21; 9:4; Dan 9:5). If his *Vorlage* read עוה, the question arises as to why he decided to use ἀνακαλύπτω here (cf. part 2 §5.1, below). Finally, the clause καὶ διασπερεῖ τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν αὐτῇ translates והפיץ יושביה. The use of ἐνοικέω for ישב is not striking because the equivalence ἐνοικέω/ישב is characteristic of LXX Isaiah, occurring sixteen out of twenty-three times in the whole of the LXX (Isa 5:9; 21:14; 22:21; 23:2, 6; 24:1, 6, 17; 26:5, 9, 18, 21; 33:24; 40:22; 65:21, 22; outside Isaiah, Lev 26:32; 2 Kgs 19:26; 22:16, 19; Jer 27:11; 31:24; 49:1). In comparison, κατοικέω renders ישב twenty-two out of 472 times in the LXX (Isa 6:11; 9:1; 10:13, 24, 31; 12:6; 13:20; 20:6; 23:18; 24:5, 6; 32:16, 18; 40:22; 42:10, 11[2x]; 44:26; 45:18; 49:19, 20; 51:6). In LXX Isa 24, ἐνοικέω/κατοικέω both stand for ישב. Did the translator differentiate between ἐνοικέω/κατοικέω in his translations of ישב? Did he use them as synonyms? Or are the uses of ἐνοικέω/κατοικέω for ישב simply the result of an erratic, on the spot translation of ישב? These questions will become clearer in part 2, below.

in this monograph are taken from Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

9. Anton Scholz, *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias* (Würzburg: Woerl, 1880), 30; Richard R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)* (London: Clay and Sons, 1904–1906), 2:220; Johann Fischer, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?* (BZAW 56; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930), 39. See also Isa 3:17 for the equivalence ἀποκαλύπτω/ערה. Among the ancient textual witnesses, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> (not confidently identified), 4QIsa<sup>f</sup>, Pesh. ܡܫܥ “to utterly destroy,” Vulg. affligo “to ruin” all attest to עוה. Targ. interpreted as follows: ותחפי בהתא אפי רברבהא על דעברו על אוריתא “and shame will cover the face of its princes because they transgressed the law.” For this translation, cf. Bruce D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes* (ArBib 11; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1987), 47.

10. Ernst Liebmman, “Der Text zu Jesaja 24–27,” ZAW 23 (1903): 212. For the phrase ἀνακαλύπτω τὸ πρόσωπον, cf. Tob 2:9; 2 Cor 3:18.

24:2

MT: והיה כעם ככהן כעבד כאדניו כשפחה כגברתה כקונה כמוכר  
כמלוה כלוה כנשה כאשר נשא בו

Translation: “The same fate will happen<sup>11</sup> to people and priest, servant and his masters, female slave and her mistress, buyer and seller, to the loaner as well as to the one taking a loan from him.”

LXX: καὶ ἔσται ὁ λαὸς ὡς ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ παῖς ὡς ὁ κύριος καὶ ἡ θεραπαινὴ ὡς ἡ κυρία ἔσται ὁ ἀγοράζων ὡς ὁ πωλῶν καὶ ὁ δανείζων ὡς ὁ δανειζόμενος καὶ ὁ ὀφείλων ὡς ὃς ὀφείλει

NETS: “And the people shall be like the priest, and the servant like the master, and the maid like the mistress; the buyer shall be like the seller, and the lender like the borrower, and the creditor like the one to whom he owes.”

LXX.D: “Und das Volk wird sein wie der Priester und der Knecht wie *der* Herr und die Magd wie *die* Herrin; wer kauft, wird sein wie *der*, *der* verkauft, und wer verleiht, wie *der*, *der* entleiht, und wer Schulden *hat*, wie *der*, dem er *schuldet*.”

LXX presents minor differences from MT. In the first half of the verse, it does not attest to the pronominal suffixes in MT. It has been suggested that the translator’s *Vorlage* already lacked the pronominal suffixes in “lord” and “mistress.”<sup>12</sup> However, that proposal is unlikely as the ancient witnesses are in line with MT.<sup>13</sup> Further, the translator reworded the last sentence of the Hebrew. Whereas MT reads “the one who lends like the one who takes a loan

11. Joüon §174i indicated that comparative clauses using the combination כ ... כ convey the idea that the two clauses under question “are declared identical in some regard” and not that the first clause is the same as the second or vice-versa. Thus, the meaning of Isa 24:2 is that “the same end will await people and priests, slaves and masters ...” and not that “the people will be like the priest, the servant like his master ...” as NASB translates. According to IBHS §11.2.9b, the comparative use of the preposition כ in Isa 24:2 expresses an agreement of “correspondence or identity” (emphasis original) between the clauses contrasted with “agreement in kind” (emphasis original), which is another possible use of the preposition כ. NASB’s translation has inadvertently understood the use of כ in Isa 24:2 as one expressing “agreement in kind” instead of “agreement of correspondence or identity.”

12. Liebmam, “Der Text,” 212.

13. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> כגברתה כשפחה כאדניו כעבד, 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> כגברתה [כשפחה] כאדניו כעבד,



from him,” LXX has “the creditor like the one to whom he owes.” Ottley rightly indicated that a paraphrase here “was almost a necessity.”<sup>14</sup> Finally, the second occurrence of ἔσται has no counterpart in MT.

24:3

MT: הבוק תבוק הארץ והבוז תבוז כי יהוה דבר את־הדבר הזה

Translation: “The earth certainly will be laid waste and certainly will be plundered because Yahweh spoke this word.”

LXX: φθορὰ φθαρήσεται ἡ γῆ καὶ προνομῇ προνομευθήσεται ἡ γῆ τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησεν ταῦτα

NETS: “The earth shall be ruined with ruin, and the earth shall be plundered with plundering, for the mouth of the Lord has spoken these things.”

LXX.D: “Die Erde wird ganz vergehen, und *die Erde* wird gänzlich geplündert werden; denn *der Mund* des Herrn hat dies gesprochen.”

As indicated in the discussion of 24:1, above, Isa 24:1, 3 are the only places where the cognates καταφθείρω/φθείρω/φθορά translate בקק.<sup>15</sup> As for the translation of inf. abs. + finite verb (2x), the translator employed the usual noun + cognate verb construction, which occurs eight times in LXX Isaiah as opposed to part. + verb, appearing only three times in the same book.<sup>16</sup> The equivalence προνομεύω/בזז appears three more times in LXX Isaiah (11:14; 42:22, 24) and several times in the rest of the LXX (Num 31:9, 32, 53; Deut 2:35; 3:7; 20:14; Josh 8:2, 27; 11:14; Jer 30:16). Ἡ γῆ has no counterpart in MT. More will be said about this plus in part 2 §5.1, below.

Targ. עבדא כריבוניה אמתא כמרתה, Pesh. מַלְאִים וְאֵלֹהִים מִיּוֹסֵף וְאֵלֹהִים מִיּוֹסֵף, and Vulg. *et sicut servus sic dominus eius sicut ancilla sic domina eius*.

14. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:221.

15. Pesh. reads שָׁח “to be destroyed” here and in 24:1. Targ. chose בָּזַז “to be despoiled,” a choice based on the appearance of the same Hebrew lexeme in 24:3b (cf. also 24:1). It then interpretively used דָּוַשׁ “to trample” in 24:3b. Vulg. has *dissipare* as it does in 24:1.

16. The statistical information above was taken from Henry St. J. Thackeray, “Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX,” *JTS* 9 (1908), 599. See also Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (MVEOL 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948), 55.

Στόμα lacks an equivalent in MT.<sup>17</sup> It has been suggested that either פה “mouth” stood in the translator’s *Vorlage* or that στόμα resulted from a double translation of כִּי, which would also have been read as פִּי.<sup>18</sup> As the expression στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησεν appears also in Isa 1:20 and 58:14 to render כִּי פִי יְהוָה דִּבֶּר, it is better to see στόμα in both 24:3 and 25:8 as the translator’s own insertion in analogy with the Hebrew and the Greek of Isa 1:20 and 58:14.

Ταῦτα “these things” stands for אֶת־הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה “this word.” It has been conjectured that the translator’s *Vorlage* perhaps read only כִּי יְהוָה דִּבֶּר.<sup>19</sup> However, all the ancient witnesses align with MT.<sup>20</sup> Ταῦτα occurs as part of the phrase ἐλάλησεν ταῦτα in Isa 1:20 and 58:14 (see also Mic 4:4), where no demonstrative pronoun זֶה is found. It is probable that the translator used ταῦτα in analogy with 1:20 and 58:14 referring to “words” that have either been spoken or written in a book. See also Isa 29:11, where ταῦτα refer to the words written in a book (γράμματα).

24:4

MT: אַבְלָה נְבִלָה הָאָרֶץ אֲמַלְלָה נְבִלָה תְּבֵל אֲמַלְלוּ מְרוֹם עַם־הָאָרֶץ

Translation: “The earth mourned, fell, the world wasted away, fell,<sup>21</sup> the high ones of the earth wasted away.”

LXX: ἐπένησεν ἡ γῆ καὶ ἐφθάρη ἡ οἰκουμένη ἐπένησαν οἱ ὑψηλοὶ τῆς γῆς

NETS: “The earth mourned, and the world was ruined; the exalted ones of the earth mourned.”

LXX.D: “Die Erde klagte, und die bewohnt Welt verging, die Erhabenen der Erde klagten.”

LXX is shorter than MT as it contains only three instead of five verbs. It has been argued that the translator’s *Vorlage* was shorter than MT.<sup>22</sup> However, all of

17. Scholz, *Jesaias*, 24.

18. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 216; Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA 12/3; Münster: Aschendorffsche, 1934), 66.

19. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 216; BHS.

20. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>, θ τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο, Targ. אֲרִי יוֹי מְלִיל יֵת פִּתְגָּמָא הַדִּין, Pesh. ܐܪܝ ܝܝܝ ܡܠܝܠ ܝܬ ܦܬܓܡܐ ܗܕܝܢ, and Vulg. *Dominus enim locutus est verbum hoc*.

21. BHK and BHS suggest the deletion of the verbs נְבִלָה and אֲמַלְלָה on the basis of their absence in the LXX.

22. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 217: “Der Grund, weshalb LXX die gleichtönenden Paare

the ancient witnesses align with MT.<sup>23</sup> It is more likely that the translator shortened his text, considering the Hebrew too long.<sup>24</sup> The one word ἐπένθησεν translates both נבֹלָה/אֲבֵלָה (cf., e.g., Isa 3:26; 16:8; 19:8; 61:2, 3). It is less clear why the translator used ἐφθάρηγ for נבֹלָה/אֲמֵלָה because nowhere else in LXX does φθείρω stand for either אֲמֵל or נבֹל. In LXX Isaiah, πενθέω “to grieve” (e.g., Isa 16:8; 19:8; 24:7) usually translates אֲמֵל, whereas ἐκρέω “to fall off” (cf. Isa 64:5) and ἀποβάλλω “to throw off” (cf. Isa 1:30) render נבֹל. Given that φθείρω does not stand for either אֲמֵל/נבֹל anywhere else, its use in Isa 24:4 will be discussed further in part 2 §5.2, below. The phrase οἱ ὑψηλοὶ “the exalted ones” translates מְרוֹם “the height of the people.” In LXX Isaiah, מְרוֹם is usually read as an adverbial adjunct of place (e.g., Isa 22:16; 26:5; 32:15; 33:5). In Isa 24:4, the translator took מְרוֹם as the subject of אֲמֵלָה, translating it with οἱ ὑψηλοὶ.

24:5

והארץ חנפה תחת ישיביה כִּי־עברו תורת חלפו חק הפרו ברית עולם

Translation: “The earth was defiled under<sup>25</sup> her inhabitants because they passed over<sup>26</sup> the laws,<sup>27</sup> they passed over<sup>28</sup> the boundaries, they broke the eternal covenant.”

der Verba nur je einmal übersetzt, kann nicht in LXX selbst liegen, da er sonst stets derartige Verbindungen genau wiedergibt.”

23. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, 4QIsa<sup>a</sup>;  $\sigma/\theta$  κατεργαφή (twice), Targ. אַתאַבלַת חַרוּבַת אֶרְעאַצְדִּיאַת חַרוּבַת, תַּבֵּל סְפּוֹ תְּקוּף עֵמָא דֶּאֶרְעָא אֵלֶּה מִטְּמֵא כֹּחֵלָא דִּי כֹּחֵלָא אֵלֶּה מִטְּמֵא סִיּוּא אֵלֶּה וְכַבֵּל, Pesh. תְּבַל סְפּוֹ תְּקוּף עֵמָא דֶּאֶרְעָא וְכַבֵּל וְכַבֵּל וְכַבֵּל וְכַבֵּל and Vulg. *luxit et defluxit terra et infirmata est defluxit orbis infirmata est altitudo populi terrae*. It is interesting to note that Pesh. has inserted the phrases “and she sat down in mourning” and “she sat down.”

24. See Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses* (SCS 61; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 189.

25. The prep. תחת, which usually means “under,” has here the nuance of “authority or control,” cf. Ronald J. Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline* (2nd ed.; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), §350. In this sense, it parallels the use of the same preposition in Gen 41:35; Num 5:19.

26. HUB indicates that 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has a ׳ above the ך of the verb עבר. However, Donald W. Parry and Elisha Qimron (*The Great Isaiah Scroll [1QIsa<sup>a</sup>]: A New Edition* [STDJ 32; Leiden: Brill, 1999], 39n2a) note that “the anagular mark above the ך is not a ׳ but a scratch in the leather; the photographs are misleading.” Hence, עברו in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>’s newest edition. Cf. Eugene Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTSup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 373.

LXX: ἡ δὲ γῆ ἡνόμησεν διὰ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτήν διότι παρέβησαν τὸν νόμον καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὰ προστάγματα διαθήκην αἰώνιον

NETS: “And the earth behaved lawlessly because of those who inhabit it, because they transgressed the law and changed the ordinances—an everlasting covenant.”

LXX.D: “Die Erde aber handelte gesetzwidrig um ihrer Bewohner willen, denn sie übertraten das Gesetz und *veränderten* die Anordnungen, einen ewigen Bund.”

The conjunction δέ is linked to the conjunction ו. The equivalence ἀνομέω “to break the law”/חָנַף “to pollute, profane” occurs only here in the whole of the LXX. In LXX Isaiah, the cognate noun ἄνομος stands for חָנַף in Isa 9:16; 10:6; 32:6, an equivalency that occurs only in Isaiah. Otherwise, ἀσεβής “ungodly” renders חָנַף in Isa 33:14. Outside Isaiah, the verbs μιáíνω “to defile” (e.g., Jer 3:1[2x], 2; Dan 11:32) and φονοκτονέω “to pollute with murder” (e.g., Num 35:33[2x]; Ps 106:38) translate חָנַף.<sup>29</sup> Given that ἀνομέω/חָנַף is not such a straightforward translation,<sup>30</sup> the use of ἀνομέω here will need more discussion (see part 2 §5.2, below). The particle ἀντί usually renders תַּחַת in LXX Isaiah.<sup>31</sup> In contrast, διὰ stands for תַּחַת only here and in Isa 60:15 and, outside Isaiah, only in Deut 4:37; Prov 30:21. It seems that the translator’s choice of διὰ involved an interpretive process and reflects his understanding of תַּחַת as expressing the reason or cause for the earth’s lawless behavior.<sup>32</sup>

27. 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> has the sing. תורה instead of the pl. תורות attested in MT and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. The massorah of the Aleppo codex notes that the pl. תורות is a *hapax legomenon* in the Hebrew Bible. The rare occurrence of this word in the pl. might have given rise to the sing. reading in 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>. The Vulg. also has the pl. *leges*. The LXX τὸν νόμον, Targ. אוריתא, and Pesh. ܐܘܪܝܬܐ have the sing.

28. HALOT, 321, proposes vocalizing the verb חָלַף as a *piel* instead of *qal*. In this way, the meaning of the verb would be “to change” or “to alter.” Contrarily, BDB, 3101 assigns “overstep, to transgress” as the *qal* meaning of חָלַף.

29. Cf. also ס’, who chose φονοκτονέω “to pollute with murder” as a translation of חָנַף in Isa 24:5. His choice was probably influenced by Num 35:33 (2x) (cf. also Ps 106:38). Das Neves (*A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 131) opined that ס’s use of φονοκτονέω may point to theological reflection.

30. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:221; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 66.

31. Isa 3:24[4x]; 37:38; 53:12, 13[3x]; 60:17[4x]; 61:3[2x].

32. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 219. Σ’s ὑπό may also be considered interpretive. See also Pesh.: ܐܬܪܬܐ ܗܝܬܬ ܠܡܫܝܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܬܐ “the earth became like its inhabitants because they transgressed.” Targ. וארעא חבת תחות יתבהא followed MT closely as far as the prepo-

LXX has the sing. τὸν νόμον “the law” for the plural תורות “laws.” The textual witnesses are divided. While 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (תורות) and Vulg. (*leges*) align with MT, 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>, Targ. (אוריתא), and Pesh. (ܬܘܪܐ, lacks the *seyame*) all attest to the singular “law.” But it is unlikely that the translator’s *Vorlage* read the sing. “law” instead of MT’s plural “laws.” With the exception of Exod 18:20; Lev 26:46, the defective תורה appears only here. This rarity may have given rise to the use of the sing. תורה in the textual witnesses. Otherwise, if the translator’s *Vorlage* aligned with MT, the question as to why he chose the singular “law” for the plural “laws” must be asked. Further, the choice of κατοικέω for יושב deserves further discussion. Why did the translator use it here instead of ἐνοικέω as in Isa 24:1, 17? More will be said about these questions in §5.2, below.

For the pair ἀλλάσσω/חלף, see Isa 40:31; 41:1. Although the translation of חק with πρόσταγμα appears only here in Isaiah, it is often attested in the LXX.<sup>33</sup> The plural προστάγματα for the sing. חק occurs here and in Ezr 7:10; Ps 99:7. Lastly, הפרו is probably not attested in LXX Isaiah due to condensation.<sup>34</sup> In Isa 24:5, διαθήκην αἰώνιον appears in apposition to τὰ προστάγματα further qualifying the former as an “everlasting covenant.” The same phenomenon occurs in LXX 1 Chr 16:17–18; Ps 104:10–11, where προστάγματα parallels διαθήκην αἰώνιον.<sup>35</sup>

24:6

MT: על-כן אלה אכלה ארץ ויאשמו ישבי בה על-כן חרו ישבי ארץ  
ונשאר אנוש מזער

Translation: “Therefore<sup>36</sup>, the curse eats<sup>37</sup> the earth<sup>38</sup> and its inhabitants bear the guilt. Therefore, the inhabitants of the earth are burned up<sup>39</sup> and a few men are left.”

sition תחת is concerned. Vulg. *et terra interfecta est ab habitatoribus suis* interpreted the preposition תחת “under” with *ab* “by.”

33. Gen 47:26; Exod 18:16, 20; Deut 11:32; 12:1; Judg 11:39; 1 Sam 30:25; 1 Kgs 8:58, 61; 9:4; 1 Chr 16:17; 22:13; 29:19; 2 Chr 7:17; 33:8; 34:31; 35:25; Ezra 7:10, 11; Neh 1:7; 9:13, 14; Job 26:10; Ps 2:7; 81:5; 94:20; 99:7; 105:10; 148:6; Jer 5:22; Ezek 20:25; 45:14; Amos 2:4; Mal 3:22.

34. HUB.

35. Cf. also *Pss. Sol.* 10:4, where the phrase “in the law of the everlasting covenant (ἐν νόμῳ διαθήκης αἰωνίου)” occurs.

36. HUB notes that the Pesh. reads ܐܠܝ ܡܢ ܗܝܠܐ “because of these,” a reading that probably omits the Hebrew word בן (cf. also Vulg., *propter hoc* “because of this”).

37. HUB noted that שׁ reads ἐπένθησεν “to grieve; to mourn.” HUB’s editor correctly pointed out that this reading is also found in the Pesh. ܫܠܝܬܐ. It is interesting to note that the Vulg. agrees with MT by translating אכל with *voro* “to devour.”

LXX: διὰ τοῦτο ἀρὰ ἔδεται τὴν γῆν ὅτι ἡμάρτοσαν οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτήν διὰ τοῦτο πτωχοὶ ἔσονται οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ καὶ καταλειφθήσονται ἄνθρωποι ὀλίγοι

NETS: “Therefore a curse will devour the earth, because those who inhabit it have sinned; therefore those who dwell in the earth will be poor, and few people will be left.”

LXX.D: “Darum wird ein Fluch die Erde fressen, weil ihre Bewohner sündigten; darum werden *arm sein*, die auf der Erde wohnen, und wenige Menschen werden übrigen bleiben.”

Ἔδεται “it will consume” links with אכלה, pointed as a past tense verb in MT “it has consumed.” It is not clear why the translator employed a future tense verb here. Even if he read אכלה as a participle, he could have translated it with a present tense verb (cf. καταφθείρει/בוקק in Isa 24:1). More will be said about this in part 2 §5.2, below. The use of the conjunction ὅτι for ἵ attracts attention as the equivalence ὅτι/ἵ does not occur often in LXX Isaiah (Isa 2:2; 9:19; 15:4; 28:17; 30:8, 20; 51:15; 53:3). The question arises as to why the translator chose ὅτι here. Liebmann thought that ἁμαρτάνω was not suitable here and saw in ὅτι ἡμάρτοσαν an indication of the translator’s worldview, arguing that ἀφανίζω “to destroy” could have been chosen to translate אשם.<sup>40</sup> However, ἁμαρτάνω translates אשם here and in Lev 5:4; 2 Chron 19:10[2x] and, as such, it is not correct to claim that ἁμαρτάνω does not suit אשם.<sup>41</sup> For a discussion of the equivalence κατοικέω/יָשַׁב, see the discussion under 24:1, above.

38. HUB observed that אָרַךְ is absent from 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.

39. Contrary to MT, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>/4QIsa<sup>c</sup> read חור from חור “to grow pale” or “to diminish.” MT’s reading “they diminished in number” fits in well with the reading “and a few men were left” in the following clause (cf. Arie van der Kooij, “The Text of Isaiah and Its Early Witnesses in Hebrew,” in *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker Offered by the Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta* [ed. Yohanan Goldman, Arie van der Kooij, and Richard D. Weiss; VTSup 110; Leiden: Brill, 2006], 148). The Targ. reads ספּו “to come to an end” and the Pesh. ܣܦܝܬܐ “to be brought to destruction; to be exterminated.” The LXX reads πτωχοὶ ἔσονται, which HUB explains as a change caused by the parallelism with the following clause. It also referred the reader to Esth 1:20. Contrarily, σ’ reads ἐκτροχωθήσονται “they will be worn out” (cf. the occurrence of this lexeme in Wis 11:11; 14:15).

40. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 49, 221. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> וישמו, Targ. וצדיא, and Pesh. ܘܫܡܐ all reflect the root שָׁמַם “to be desolate.” Contrarily, the fut. *peccabunt* in Vulg. is in line with LXX.

41. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:221.

The expression πτωχοὶ ἔσονται stands in place of חרו. Some have claimed חרו presented the translator with some lexical difficulty,<sup>42</sup> while one scholar has suggested the translator read ידלו “they will become small, unimportant” for חרו.<sup>43</sup> Part 2 §5.2, below, will probe whether πτωχοὶ ἔσονται fits in its literary context. Although the equivalence καταλείπω/רשׁ occurs often in LXX Isaiah,<sup>44</sup> the verb ὑπολείπω “to leave remaining” (Isa 4:3) and the nouns κατάλοιπος “left, remaining” (Isa 21:17), λοιπός “left” (Isa 17:3), and κατάλειμμα “remnant” (Isa 10:22; 14:22) also appear. As such, it will still be important to discuss why the translator decided to use his default word in LXX Isa 24:6 (see the discussion in part 2 §5.5 under Isa 24:14).

24:7

MT: אבֹל תִּירוֹשׁ אִמְלֵלָה גִּפְן נֶאֱחָזוּ כָּל־שִׂמְחֵי־לֵב

Translation: “The wine dries up, the vine withers, all the joyous of heart groan.”

LXX: πενθήσει οἶνος πενθήσει ἄμπελος στενάξουσιν πάντες οἱ εὐφραινόμενοι τὴν ψυχὴν

NETS: “The wine will mourn; the vine will mourn; all who rejoice in their soul will groan.”

LXX.D: “Der Wein wird klagen, die Rebe wird klagen, alle, die sich (jetzt) von Herzen freuen, werden seufzen.”

For the use of πενθέω for אבֹל/אמלל, see the comments on 24:4, above. Στενάζω “to bemoan” translates אָנַח “to sigh, groan” only here and in 21:2 for the cognate noun אִנְחָה “sigh, groan” (outside Isaiah, cf. Lam 1:8, 21; Ezek 21:11, 12). The translator’s choice of στενάζω can be further appreciated in light of Isa 19:8, where στενάζω and πενθέω are also parallel.<sup>45</sup> The future tense in the Greek will be addressed in part 2 §5.2, below. The equivalence שִׂמְחָה/εὐφραίνω occurs often in LXX. In the LXX, καρδία “heart” usually renders לֵב “heart” (cf., e.g., Isa 6:10). The equivalence ψυχὴ “soul, life”/לֵב occurs only thirteen

42. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 67; HUB.

43. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:221.

44. Isa 10:19, 20, 21; 11:11[2x], 16; 16:14; 17:6; 24:12; 28:5; 49:21. Cf. ὑπολειφθήσεται in α’.

45. GELS, 634.

times in the whole of the LXX, while appearing three times in LXX Isaiah (Isa 24:7; 33:18; 42:25).

24:8

MT: שבת משוש תפים חדל שאון עליזים שבת משוש כנור

Translation: “The joy of the tambourines has ceased, the uproar of the jubilant has stopped, the joy of the lyre has ceased.”

LXX: πέπαυται εὐφροσύνη τυμπάνων πέπαυται αὐθάδεια καὶ πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν πέπαυται φωνὴ κιθάρας

NETS: “The joy of the drums has ceased; the stubbornness and wealth of the impious have ceased; the sound of the lyre has ceased.”

LXX.D: “Vergangen ist die Freude der Handpauken, vergangen sind *Anmaßung und Reichtum* der Gottlosen, vergangen ist der Klang der Leier.”

Παύω translates שבת here and in Isa 16:10; 33:8 (cf. also Exod 31:17; Deut 32:26; Prov 18:18; Jer 31:36) and חדל in Isa 1:16 (cf. also Gen 11:8; Exod 9:29, 34). Εὐφροσύνη renders משוש here and in Isa 32:13, 14; 60:15, 18 (cf. also Lam 2:15; Hos 2:13). Τύμπανον translates תה about fourteen times (cf. Isa 5:12; Gen 31:27; Exod 15:20[2x]; Judg 11:34; 1 Sam 10:5; 18:6; 2 Sam 6:5; 1 Chron 13:8; Ps 81:3; 149:3; 150:4; Jer 31:4).

The phrase αὐθάδεια καὶ πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν “the arrogance and wealth of the ungodly” in place of שאון עליזים “the uproar of the jubilant” is striking.<sup>46</sup> The equivalences αὐθάδεια/שאון and πλοῦτος/שאון appear only here in the whole of the LXX. The use of κραυγῆς “crying, shouting” for שאון in Isa 66:6 shows that the translator knew that שאון has something to do with “shouting.” One scholar has suggested that the translator read גאון “exaltation, majesty, excellence” in place of שאון.<sup>47</sup> However, nowhere else in the LXX is גאון translated with either αὐθάδεια or πλοῦτος. Others have proposed that the translator perhaps read שאון as שאנן “self-confident” or “arrogant.”<sup>48</sup> A recent sugges-

46. Cf. Targ. *אתמנעת אתרגושת תקיפין* “the strong tumult ceased,” Pesh. *סעל מלך גנע* “the voice of the one exulting ceased,” Vulg. *quievit sonitus laetantium* “the noise of the ones rejoicing was made inactive.”

47. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 224.

48. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:221; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 186. For the mean-



tion is that the translator linked שֹׁאֵן with “a derivation of the root נָשָׂא – ‘to raise,’ for instance with שֹׁאֵת – ‘elevation.’”<sup>49</sup> Another suggestion is that the phrase αὐθάδεια καὶ πλοῦτος is a double translation of שֹׁאֵן.<sup>50</sup> It seems that αὐθάδεια καὶ πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν interprets שֹׁאֵן עֲלִיזִים. For the translator, עֲלִיזִים suggested some sort of “arrogance” that was linked to “wealth.” For instance, he used ὑβρίζω “to treat arrogantly” for עֲלִיזִים “jubilant”/גְּאוּנָה “loftiness” in Isa 13:3 and ὑβρίς “arrogance” for עֲלִיזִים in Isa 23:7.<sup>51</sup> Similarly, the translator also rendered עֲלִיזִים with πλούσιος “wealthy” in Isa 32:13. On the other hand, the translator also associated שֹׁאֵן with “wealth” (cf. πλούσιος/שֹׁאֵן in Isa 5:14) and, perhaps, with “arrogance” as well.<sup>52</sup> As for the reading ἀσεβῶν “ungodly,” it has been suggested that the translator read עֲלִיזִים “jubilant” as עֲרִיצִים “violent, tyrant” (cf. Isa 29:5).<sup>53</sup> Be that as it may, the question arises as to why the translator decided to insert the phrase αὐθάδεια καὶ πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν here. More will be discussed in part 2 §5.3, below. Finally, the use of φωνή in place of the second מְשׁוּשׁ points to an *ad sensum* translation.<sup>54</sup>

24:9

MT: בְּשִׁיר לֹא יִשְׁתּוּ יַיִן יִמְרָם שֶׁכָּר לִשְׁתִּיּוֹ

Translation: “With the song they do not drink wine, the beer that they drink is bitter.”

LXX: ἡσχύνθησαν οὐκ ἔπιον οἶνον πικρὸν ἐγένετο τὸ σικερα τοῖς πίνουσιν

NETS: “They felt shame, did not drink wine; the sikera became bitter to those who drank it.”

LXX.D: “*Sie schämten sich, tranken keinen Wein (mehr), bitter wurde das Sikera denen, die es tranken.*”

ing “arrogant,” cf. BDB, 9601. For the equivalence πλούσιος/πλοῦτος/שֹׁאֵן, cf. Isa 32:9, 18; 33:20.

49. Van der Vorm Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 148.

50. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 66; HUB.

51. For the function of ὑβρίς in Isa 23, cf. Arie van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision* (VTSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 58, 81–82.

52. Cf. בְּנֵי שֹׁאֵן (Jer 48:45), which may be translated as “noisy boasters” (so NIV).

53. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 224; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 186.

54. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 186.

The verb ἡσχύνθησαν “they were put to shame” is a rereading of בשׂיר “with the song” as בושׂ “to be ashamed” due to their graphic similarities.<sup>55</sup> In Isaiah, αἰσχύνομαι translates בושׂ in the majority of its occurrences (Isa 1:29; 20:5; 23:4; 26:11; 29:22; 41:11; 42:17; 44:9, 11; 45:16, 17, 24; 49:23; 50:7; 65:13; 66:5) except in Isa 33:9 where it translates the Hebrew חפר “to feel ashamed.” The choice to read בושׂ instead of בשׂיר is not the result of the translator’s poor knowledge of Hebrew. He is acquainted with the meaning of שׂיר, translating it with ᾠσμα “song” in Isa 26:1 and with ὕμνος “hymn, praise” in Isa 42:10. Such a rereading requires a discussion as to whether ἡσχύνθησαν coheres with its literary context (cf. part 2 §5.3, below). Another difference in the LXX is the use of past tense verbs (ἔπιον/ἐγένετο) for imperfect ones (יִשְׁתו/יִמְרו) in MT (cf. part 2 §5.3, below). Finally, LXX lacks the pronominal suffix in לַשְׁתִּי “to the ones drinking it”<sup>56</sup> as it would be superfluous in Greek (cf. the article τοῖς).

24:10

MT: נִשְׁבְּרָה קִרְיַת־תְּהוּ סֹגֵר כָּל־בֵּית מְבוּא

Translation: “The city of nothingness is broken up, every<sup>57</sup> house is closed from entering.”

LXX: ἡρημώθη πᾶσα πόλις κλείσει οἰκίαν τοῦ μὴ εἰσελθεῖν

NETS: “Every city was made desolate; he will shut the house so that no one can enter.”

LXX.D: “Jede Stadt wurde öde gemacht, er wird (jedes) Haus verschließen, damit man nicht mehr hineingehen kann.”

In the LXX, the equivalence ἡρημώω/שׁבר does not occur. Ἡρημώθη clearly translates the phrase נִשְׁבְּרָה תְּהוּ.<sup>58</sup> However, the question as to why the trans-

55. Scholz, *Jesaias*, 29; Liebmann, “Der Text,” 224; Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:221. It is not clear whether das Neves (*A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 186, 194) viewed ἡσχύνθησαν as the result of a rereading of בשׂיר as בושׂ or not. While he denied ἡσχύνθησαν was the result of a rereading on p. 186, he asserted it on p. 194.

56. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 224. Cf. Targ. לַשְׁתִּי, Pesh. ܠܫܬܝܐ, and Vulg. *illam*.

57. The word כָּל attached to an indefinite noun has an “individualizing” (GKC §127b; *IBHS* §15.6c) or “distributive” (Williams, *Hebrew Syntax* §105) sense. Thus, Isa 24:10b should be translated as “every house ...” as most Bible translations correctly do.

58. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 224, against Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:221; das Neves, *A Teologia da*

lator employed the lexeme ἐρημόω here still remains (cf. part 2 §5.3, below). Πόλις often translates עיר. The equivalence πόλις/קריה appears eight times in LXX Isaiah out of twenty-six times in the whole LXX.<sup>59</sup> The rarity of the equivalence under discussion raises the question as to why the translator decided to employ πόλις here (cf. discussion on part 2 §5.3, below). Πᾶσα translates בל, which in MT is attached to “house” but in the LXX to “city,” suggesting more than one city.<sup>60</sup> Further, LXX reads the passive סגר as an active verb: κλείσει “he will close.” The future tense may be possibly explained as due to haplography caused by reading the ו in the preceding תהו as a ך.

24:11

MT: צוּחָה עַל־הָיִין בַּחוּצוֹת עֲרֵבָה כָּל־שִׂמְחָה גֵּלָה מִשּׁוֹשׁ הָאָרֶץ

Translation: “There is a cry concerning the wine outside, all joy has come to dawn; the joy of the earth went away.”

LXX: ὀλολύζετε περὶ τοῦ οἴνου πανταχῇ πέπνυται πᾶσα εὐφροσύνη τῆς γῆς

NETS: “Wail everywhere for the wine; all the joy of the earth has ceased.”

LXX.D: “*Erhebt ein Wehgeschrei um den Wein überall! Vergangen ist alle Freude der Erde.*”

The plural imperative ὀλολύζετε “wail” stands in place of the noun צוּחָה “outcry.” The noun צוּחָה is rare, appearing only four times in the OT.<sup>61</sup> Some scholars have proposed that the translator perhaps read צוּחָה as the imperative צוּחוּ.<sup>62</sup> It could also be that the translator read צוּחָה via a feminine plural

*Tradução Grega*, 187. A similar interpretation to LXX Isaiah is found in the Pesh. נִשְׁבְּרָה תְּהוּ “the city was plundered”, which employed only one verb for the phrase נִשְׁבְּרָה תְּהוּ. Cf. Targ. אִיתְּבֵרַת קִרְתְּהוֹן צְדִיאוֹת and Vulg. *adtrita est civitas vanitatis*. The expression נִשְׁבְּרָה תְּהוּ appears only in Isa 24:10 in the Hebrew Bible and Qumran documents.

59. Isa 1:21; 24:10; 25:2, 3; 26:5; 29:1; 32:13; 33:20.

60. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:221; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 187.

61. Ps 144:14; Isa 24:11; Jer 14:2; 46:15.

62. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 226; David A. Baer, *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66* (JSOTSup 318; The Hebrew Bible and Its Versions 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 34.

Aramaic or as an imperative Hebrew with a paragogic *-heh*.<sup>63</sup> The plural ὀλολύξετε is due to contextual reasons as it is addressed to the “ungodly” of Isa 24:8 (cf. part 2 §5.3, below).<sup>64</sup> Except for Isa 10:10, ὀλολύζω invariably translates the Hebrew יָלַל “to howl, lament.” The equivalence πανταχῇ “everywhere”/חוץ “outside” occurs only here in the whole of the LXX. The Isaiah translator does know חוץ as indicating a space “outside” because he translated it with ἔξω “outside” in Isa 42:2; 51:23. He also knows חוצות as “lanes, streets” (cf. ὁδός “way” in Isa 5:25; πλατεῖα “wide road, street” in Isa 15:3). The translator used the rare πανταχῇ here because the context indicates that Isa 24 is talking about the “world” at large.<sup>65</sup> As such, the translator found the translation with “everywhere” as most appropriate.<sup>66</sup>

LXX has only two instead of MT’s three clauses. Although it has been argued that the translator’s *Vorlage* lacked the phrase גִּלְיָה מְשׁוּשׁ “the joy has gone away,”<sup>67</sup> it has become increasingly clear that the translator himself dropped the words in question due to their parallelism with the preceding עֲרֵבָה כְּלִישְׁמָחָה.<sup>68</sup> Πέπαυται “it has ceased” captures well the idea transmitted in the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

24:12

MT: נִשְׂאָר בְּעִיר שְׁמָה וּשְׂאִיָּה יִכְתַּל־שַׁעַר

Translation: “Horror is left in the city and the gate has been beaten to pieces.”<sup>69</sup>

63. Whether the paragogic *-heh* can be theoretically present in the second fem. sing. and pl. forms, besides the usual masc. sing., is debatable, cf. Joüon §131n5.

64. For ὀλολύξετε, cf. Isa 13:6; 14:31; 15:2, 3; 23:1, 14; 24:11; 52:5. With the exception of LXX Jer 31:31, ὀλολύξετε appears only in LXX Isaiah.

65. Πανταχῇ appears only three times in the LXX (2 Macc 8:7; Wis 2:9; Isa 24:11), once in the NT (Acts 21:28), once in the OT psdeupigrapha (Aristeas 1:24); three times in Philo (Agr. 1:91; Migr. 1:216; Somn. 1:235), and only once in the Apostolic Fathers (1 Clem. 65:2).

66. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 47: “בְּחוּצוֹת = πανταχῇ (24,11), weil später von der Erde die Rede ist.”

67. Liebmann, “Der Text” 227. Against Liebmann, all the ancient witnesses are in line with MT. In addition to 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>, cf. θ’ απεσχισθη χαρα, Targ. שלימת כל חדותא, גִּלְיָה בִיע מן ארעא, Pesh. גִּלְיָה בִיע מן ארעא, and Vulg. deserta est omnis laetitia translatum est gaudium terrae.

68. Otteley, *Isaiah*, 2:221; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 49; van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 202.

69. GKC §121d claims that שְׂאִיָּה “ruin, destruction” functions here as “an accusative

LXX: καὶ καταλειφθήσονται πόλεις ἔρημοι καὶ οἴκοι ἐγκαταλελειμμένοι ἀπολοῦνται

NETS: “And cities will be left desolate; abandoned houses will perish.”

LXX.D: “Und Städte werden öde zurückgelassen werden, und Häuser werden verlassen werden und verfallen.”

The conjunction καὶ is a plus against MT. On the basis of 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> (ונשאר) and Pesh. (ܝܢܫܐܪ), it is very plausible that the translator's *Vorlage* read ונשאר instead of MT's נשאר.<sup>70</sup> For the equivalence καταλείπω/נשא, see the comments to Isa 24:6, above. If the translator's *Vorlage* aligned with MT, the future καταλειφθήσονται for the past נשאר is striking. Maybe the translator read נשאר as a participle, translating it with a future tense verb. More will be said about this on part 2 §5.3, below. Equally remarkable is the plural πόλεις “cities” for the singular בעיר “in the city.” Some scholars saw in πόλεις an indication that the translator's *Vorlage* read העיר.<sup>71</sup> Part 2 §5.3, below, will also further discuss this issue. With the exception of Jer 2:15, the combination ἔρημος “desolate”/שמה “horror” appears solely in LXX Isaiah (5:9; 13:9; 24:12; cf. also ἔρημος/שממה in Isa 6:11). The rarity of this combination raises the question as to why the translator used ἔρημος here. See the discussion in part 2 §5.3, below.

The clause καὶ οἴκοι ἐγκαταλελειμμένοι ἀπολοῦνται “and abandoned houses will perish” differs considerably from MT's ושאיה יכתשער “and the gate has been beaten to pieces.” The explanations for this substantial divergence have varied greatly. One scholar found in οἴκοι an indication for a different *Vorlage* behind the LXX, which contained בית “house” in place of יכת due to the similarity of the letters כ/ב and through metathesis of כ/י.<sup>72</sup> Other scholars attributed the same process above to the translator himself, who read בית as יכת.<sup>73</sup> However, there is no evidence of a *Vorlage* that read “houses” among the present textual witnesses.<sup>74</sup> At the same time, to argue that the translator

---

of result” preceding the passive verb יכת. Thus, this clause should be translated with NIV, RSV, and NJPS as “the gate was beaten to pieces” (emphasis added).

70. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> נשאר בעיר שמה, Targ. אשתאר בקרתא צדו, and Vulg. *relicta est in urbe solitudo* lack the conjunction ו.

71. Scholz, *Jesaias*, 29; Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 40. Otherwise, argued Fischer, πόλεις may have been the result of a free translation. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> בעיר, 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> בער, Targ. בקרתא, Pesh. ܒܥܝܪܐ, and Vulg. *in urbe* align with MT.

72. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 228. The phrase “LXX scheint einen andern Text zu haben” preceded Liebmann's explanation of how בית can be recovered out of יכת.

73. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:222; Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 40.

74. Cf. n. 73, above.

arrived at “houses” by changing a ב for a כ and by exchanging their position may be too far-fetched. For more on “houses,” see part 2 §5.3, below.

As for ἐγκαταλειμμένοι “abandoned,” proposals were that the translator read שאיה “desolation” as שאה “to lie desolate” because καταλείπω “to leave behind” renders שאה in Isa 6:11.<sup>75</sup> Other explanations link ἐγκαταλειμμένοι with reading שער “gate” as שאר “to leave behind.”<sup>76</sup> Although the suggestions above may be correct, the problem is that they try to account for the divergence in the LXX without paying serious attention to its literary context. Part 2 §5.3, below, will attempt to provide an explanation that is based on broader considerations than the word level.

Finally, one scholar saw in ἀπολοῦνται “they will perish” an indication for a different *Vorlage* that read יִשָּׁבֵר “it will be broken.”<sup>77</sup> Other proposals are that ἀπολοῦνται may stand for שאיה or that the translator read שער “gate” as Aramaic שרע “to fall down.”<sup>78</sup> It seems clear that ἀπολοῦνται is linked with שאיה “desolation.”

24:13

MT: כִּי כֹה יִהְיֶה בִּקְרֵב הָאָרֶץ בְּתוֹךְ הָעַמִּים כְּנֻקָּה זֵית כְּעוֹלָלַת אִם-כֻּלָּהּ  
בְּצִיר

Translation: “Because thus it will happen in the midst of the earth, in the midst of the peoples, as the beating of an olive tree, as the gleanings, whenever it is consumed in the vintage.”

LXX: ταῦτα πάντα ἔσται ἐν τῇ γῇ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐθνῶν ὃν τρόπον ἐάν τις καλαμῆσῃται ἐλαίαν οὕτως καλαμῆσονται αὐτούς καὶ ἐὰν παύσῃται ὁ τρύγητος

NETS: “All these things shall be on the earth, in the midst of the nations; just when someone glean an olive tree, so shall people glean them, even when the harvest has ceased.”

LXX.D: “*All dies* wird geschehen auf der Erde inmitten der Völker-

75. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 228; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 144.

76. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:222; Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 40; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 144. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 229, also entertained the same proposal.

77. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 229.

78. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:222; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 144 represent the first proposal, while Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 40 does the latter.

schaften; in der Weise, wie wenn jemand einen Ölbaum aberntet, so wird man sie abernten, auch wenn die Weinlese zu Ende geht.”

The expression ταῦτα πάντα “all these things” stands in place of כִּי כֹה “for thus.” In the LXX, the equivalence οὗτος/כֹּה occurs only four times, one of which is Isa 24:13 (the other three are Exod 7:16; 1 Kgs 5:25; Ezek 25:13). As for πάντα, its relationship to MT is even more difficult to explain. Some proposed that the translator’s *Vorlage* either lacked כִּי or that he read כל “all” for כִּי or כֹּה,<sup>79</sup> others that he rendered *ad sensum*.<sup>80</sup> To solve this conundrum, it will be important to see whether ταῦτα πάντα makes sense in its context (cf. part 2 §5.4, below).

The phrase ἐν τῇ γῇ “on the earth” translates בקרב הארץ “in the midst of the earth.” Although some affirmed that קרב “midst” was “omitted,”<sup>81</sup> the Hebrew term is in fact implied in the construction ἐν + dative.<sup>82</sup> In LXX Isaiah, בקרב הארץ is translated either with ἐν + dative (e.g., Isa 19:24; 24:13) or with ἐπί + genitive (e.g., Isa 5:8; 6:12; 7:22). The expression ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐθνῶν follows the Hebrew בתוך העמים closely. It is interesting to note that עם is usually rendered with λαός in LXX Isaiah and not with ἔθνος (cf. discussion on LXX Isa 25:6 in ch. 3 of the present study).

The expression ὃν τρόπον ἐάν τις καλαμῆσῃται ἐλαίαν “in the way, when someone gleanes an olive tree” translates כִּנְקָה זֵית “like the beating of an olive tree.” In the same way, οὕτως καλαμῆσονται αὐτούς “thus they will strip them” is somewhat linked to כְּעוֹלָלָת “like gleanings.” The phrase זֵית כְּעוֹלָלָת appears in Isa 17:6 in reverse order: עוֹלָלָת כִּנְקָה זֵית. There, καλάμη “straw, stalk” seems to be in place of עוֹלָלָת<sup>83</sup> and ὡς ῥῶγες ἐλαίας “like berries of an olive tree” stands for כִּנְקָה זֵית.<sup>84</sup> Some have argued that נִקָּה was not translated because the translator was not acquainted with it.<sup>85</sup> However, it seems that the

79. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 229; Scholz, *Jesaias*, 29; Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:222; Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 40. Among the ancient textual witnesses, only Pesh. lacks the conjunction כִּי. Liebmann (“Der Text,” 229) opined that the question as to whether the Pesh. translator’s *Vorlage* lacked כִּי or whether the translator dropped it must remain open.

80. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 189.

81. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:222.

82. In the rest of the LXX, with the exception of ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς/τῆς ἀρχῆς in Ps 74:12, בקרב הארץ is translated either with ἐπί + genitive (e.g., Gen 45:6; 48:16) or ἐν + dative (e.g., Deut 4:5). See also πάσης τῆς γῆς/τῆς ἀρχῆς in Exod 8:18).

83. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:191 rightly explains the relationship between ‘ōlēlōt “gleanings” in MT and “straw, stalk” in LXX by pointing out that “stalks” are what “gleaners get.”

84. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 95.

85. Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (SJSJ 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 135.

picture transmitted by נקף is well represented in καλαμήσεται “gleans.” For the equivalence καλαμάομαι/עוללל, see Isa 3:12. Important to note here is the subject “they” implied in καλαμήςονται and the translator’s addition of αὐτούς “them.” Part 2 §5.4, below, will talk about the identity of “they” and “them.”

24:14

MT: המה ישאו קולם ירנו בגאון יהוה צהלו מים

Translation: “They themselves will raise their voice, they will yell<sup>86</sup> concerning the majesty of Yahweh<sup>87</sup> they have shouted from the sea.”

LXX: οὗτοι φωνῇ βοήσονται οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εὐφρανθήσονται ἅμα τῇ δόξῃ κυρίου ταραχθήσεται τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς θαλάσσης

NETS: “These will cry aloud with their voice, but those who are left in the land will rejoice together in the glory of the Lord. The water of the sea will be troubled.”

LXX.D: “Diese (die Opfer der Vernichtung) werden mit (lauter) Stimme schreien, *aber die, die auf der Erde übrig geblieben sind*, werden sich *zugleich* freuen an der Herrlichkeit des Herrn. *Das Wasser des Meeres wird aufgewühlt werden.*”

The phrase οὗτοι φωνῇ βοήσονται: “these will cry aloud with the voice” translates המה ישאו קולם “they themselves will raise their voice.” Οὗτοι stands for המה. Φωνῇ βοήσονται stands for ישאו קולם, where the pronominal suffix “them” was dropped in the LXX. The phrases נשא קול “to lift the voice” and הרים קול “to raise the voice” appear in Isa 13:2; 37:23; 52:8 where they are

86. Whereas 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> ירנו aligns with MT, 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> reads ורננו. The ך in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> was the result of correction (cf. Parry and Qimron, *The Great Isaiah Scroll*, 39n10a). Perhaps the reading in 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> was the result of harmonization with ורננו in Isa 26:19.

87. In 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> there is a blank space between the phrases “concerning the majesty of Yahweh” and “they have shouted from the sea.” This shows that 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> takes “concerning the majesty of Yahweh” with the verb ירנו, thus yielding the reading “they will yell concerning the majesty of Yahweh.” The MT has, instead, taken the phrase “concerning the majesty of Yahweh” together with the last clause of v. 14, as the *atnah* under ירנו indicates. As a result, MT reads: “concerning the majesty of Yahweh they have shouted from the sea.” The copula *waw* attached to צהלו in 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> indicates that in 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>, too, the phrase “they have shouted from the sea” is separated from “concerning the majesty of Yahweh” immediately preceding it, just as in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.



rendered by ὑψόω “to lift up.” This implies that the use of βοάω in 24:14 is somewhat unusual.<sup>88</sup> However, βοάω might reflect the verb צהל in MT 24:14c because βοάω renders צהל in Isa 54:1. It is important to note here the translator’s decision to use βοάω (cf. part 2 §5.5, below).

The clause οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εὐφρανθήσονται ἅμα τῇ δόξῃ κυρίου “but the ones left on the earth will rejoice together in the glory of the Lord” relates to יהוה בגאון ירנו “they will yell concerning the majesty of Yahweh.” The particle δέ is a plus in the Greek (for more on it, cf. part 2 §5.5, below). Opinions have diverged on the phrase οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. While one scholar argued this phrase was a later addition,<sup>89</sup> another claimed that a Hebrew equivalent in the form of הנשארים בארץ “those who are being left on the earth” already stood in the margin of the translator’s *Vorlage* as an exegetical aid.<sup>90</sup> Be that as it may, it will be important to discuss in part 2 §5.5, below, how the expression under discussion fits in its literary context.

The equivalence εὐφραίνω/רנ appears often in LXX Isaiah.<sup>91</sup> The word ἅμα “together” renders the preposition ב in בגאון.<sup>92</sup> Although the phrase τῇ δόξῃ κυρίου “at the glory of the Lord” renders יהוה בגאון,<sup>93</sup> גאון is not usually translated with δόξα in LXX Isaiah or in the whole of the LXX. The equivalence δόξα/גאון appears only four times in the LXX.<sup>94</sup> As such, the use of δόξα for גאון will deserve further treatment in part 2 §5.5, below.

The clause παραχθήσεται τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς θαλάσσης “the water of the sea will be stirred” is in place of מהלו מים “they have shouted from the sea.” The phrase τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς θαλάσσης indicates that the translator read מים מי as מים.<sup>95</sup> This type of reading is a good example of midrashic exegesis in LXX Isaiah.<sup>96</sup> As

88. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 226. Cf. σ': οὗτοι δὲ ἐπαροῦσι φωνὴν αὐτῶν.

89. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 50. Liebmann reasoned that it is not the style of the LXX to give such a long explanation.

90. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 59.

91. Isa 12:6; 16:10; 24:14; 26:19; 42:11; 44:23; 49:13; 52:8; 54:1. The same equivalence is rare in the rest of the LXX (cf. Deut 32:43; 1 Chr 16:33; Jer 31:12). Outside of Isaiah, the pair ἀγαλλιάσθαι/רנ appears more often, in LXX Isaiah it occurs only in Isa 65:14. It is interesting to compare LXX Isaiah’s translation with that of σ', where ἀγαλλιάσονται occurs.

92. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 43. See also Isa 3:16; 19:14.

93. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 226.

94. Exod 15:7; Isa 14:11; 24:14; Mic 5:3. In LXX Isaiah, the lexemes ὕβρις “arrogance” (Isa 13:11; 16:6), ὑπερηφάνια “pride” (Isa 16:6), ἰσχύς “strength” (Isa 2:10, 19, 21), ὑψόω “to lift up” (Isa 4:2), and ἀγαλλίαμα “rejoice” (Isa 60:15) stand for גאון.

95. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:222; Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 40; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 227.

96. Arie van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 68.

for *ταραχθήσεται*, it is not clear how it is linked to the *Vorlage*. The verb *הלה* “to shout” appears four times in Isaiah, being translated with *ἀγαλλιάομαι* in Isa 12:6 and *βοάω* in Isa 54:1; it is not translated in Isa 10:30. *Ἀγαλλιάομαι* indicates the translator was acquainted with *לַהֵל* as “rejoicing,” showing that his use of *ταράσσω* in 24:14 is not due to a lack of knowledge. For *ταράσσω* and *θάλασσα*, see Isa 51:15.

24:15

MT: *על־כן בארים כבודו יהוה בא״י הים שם יהוה אלהי ישראל*

Translation: “Therefore, in the east honor Yahweh, among the islands of the sea [honor] the name of Yahweh, the God of Israel.”

LXX: *διὰ τοῦτο ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐν ταῖς νήσοις ἔσται τῆς θαλάσσης τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ἔνδοξον ἔσται*

NETS: “Therefore the glory of the Lord will be in the islands of the sea; the name of the Lord will be glorious.”

LXX.D: “darum *wird die Herrlichkeit* der Herrn auf den Inseln des Meeres *sein, wird* der Name des Herrn *herrlich sein*.”

Clause 24:15a, *διὰ τοῦτο ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐν ταῖς νήσοις ἔσται τῆς θαλάσσης* “therefore, the glory of the Lord will be in the islands of the sea” stands for *על־כן הים בארים כבודו יהוה בא״י* “therefore, in the east honor Yahweh, among the islands of the sea.” Instead of MT’s imperatival “glorify,” LXX has “the glory.” Two possible explanations are in order: (1) the translator’s *Vorlage* read *כבוד* (see 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>) or (2) the translator read *כבודו* as *כבוד*.<sup>97</sup> For further discussion, see part 2 §5.5, below. “ἔσται [2x] is a plus against MT and it was introduced to make the meaning of the nonverbal clauses clear in Greek.<sup>98</sup> As for *בארים* “in the east,” it has been argued that the translator “almost certainly” “omitted” it “owing to confusion with” the following *בא״י* “in the islands.”<sup>99</sup> Another opinion is that *בארים* was not translated for being difficult.<sup>100</sup> An interesting suggestion is that the translator interpreted *בארים* in the sense of “in the lights” as pointing to something that is “famous, renowned” and translated it

97. Liebmann (“Der Text,” 233) suggested that the translator read *כבוד* for *כבודו*.

98. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 227.

99. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:222.

100. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 227.

with ἔνδοξον ἔσται “will be glorious.”<sup>101</sup> The expression τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ἔνδοξον ἔσται “the name of the Lord will be glorious” relates to שם יהוה “the name of Yahweh.” The phrase ἔνδοξον ἔσται, if not linked to בארים (see comments above), is a plus against MT.

24:16

MT: מכנף הארץ זמרת שמענו צבי לצדיק ואמר רזי-לי רזי-לי אוי לי  
בגדים בגדו ובגד בוגדים בגדו

Translation: “From the extremity of the earth we heard songs: ‘Glory/beauty to the [R]ighteous [O]ne.’ And I said:<sup>102</sup> ‘Gauntness<sup>103</sup> to me, gauntness to me, woe to me.’<sup>104</sup> The ones acting faithlessly have acted faithlessly. The ones acting faithlessly have committed faithlessness.”

LXX: κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ ἀπὸ τῶν πτερύγων τῆς γῆς τέρατα ἠκούσαμεν ἐλπίς τῷ εὐσεβεῖ καὶ ἐρῶσιν οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον

NETS: “O Lord God of Israel, from the wings of the earth we have heard wonders: Hope for the godly one. But those who reject the law will say, woe to those who reject!”

LXX.D: “Herr, (du) Gott Israels, von den Zipfeln der Erde hörten wir von Wundern: »Hoffnung für den Frommen«. Und man wird sagen: »Wehe denen, die untreu sind, die dem Gesetz untreu sind!«”

The phrase κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ links to אלהי ישראל from the preceding verse. The vocative “Lord” is a plus. Its use with “God of Israel” appears often in the

101. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 233.

102. MT reads ואמר “and I said.” Vulg. *dixi* agrees with MT; 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> ואמר, θ’/α’ καὶ ἐρεῖ, σ’ καὶ εἶπεν, Targ. אמר, and Pesh. ܐܡܪ read the third per. sing.: “and he said,” while LXX has the third per. pl. “they said.” Van der Kooij (“Isaiah 24–27,” 13) claimed that “1QIsa<sup>a</sup> may witness the third per. sing. tradition (otherwise one would expect the longer form (ואמרה).” He further noted “the versions strongly support the 3 pers sing,” although “the 1 pers sing of MT (cf. Vulg.) does, however, make sense in the light of לי (three times) in the direct speech that follows.”

103. This translation follows Bosman and van Grol (“Annotated Translation of Isaiah 24–27,” 5) who argued that רזי is in opposition to צבי “beauty.”

104. Van der Kooij (“Isaiah 24–27,” 13) rightly claimed that “the versions from Theod. up to Vulg. attest a tradition of rendering רז as ‘mystery.’”

LXX.<sup>105</sup> The stereotyped use of “O Lord, God of Israel” is probably behind the plus “O Lord” in LXX Isa 24:16a. The plural τῶν πτερύγων “of the wings” renders the singular מכנף “from the wing.” The only other geographical use of כנף in Isaiah appears in 11:12, where it occurs as a plural noun, being translated with the plural of πτέρυξ.<sup>106</sup> The term τέρατα “wonders” substitutes זמרת “songs.” The latter occurs only seven times in the Hebrew Bible of which two appear in Isaiah (24:16; 25:5). While some scholars have opined that τέρατα was a paraphrase/interpretation of זמרת either as a “misunderstanding” or as a conscious interpretation,<sup>107</sup> others argued that the translator heard דמרת from the Aram. root דמר “to be stupefied, astonished” due to the similarity in sound between the letters ז and ד.<sup>108</sup> However, it is unlikely that the translator did not know the term זמרת as “songs” because he translated זמר in Isa 12:5 with ὑμνέω (cf. זמרה/ᾠδεις in Isa 51:3).<sup>109</sup> Another view is that the translator introduced τέρατα here for theological reasons, in the light of θαυμαστὰ πράγματα in Isa 25:1.<sup>110</sup> These divergent opinions concerning the origin of τέρατα give a good opportunity to discuss, in part 2 §5.5 (below), its function in its literary context.

The phrase ἐλπίς τῷ εὐσεβεῖ “hope to the godly” stands for צבי לצדיק “glory to the [R]ighteous.”<sup>111</sup> The equivalence ἐλπίς/צבי occurs only in Isaiah (24:16; 28:4, 5). Some advanced that the translator mistakenly read צבי “beauty” as צפה or just resorted to his favorite ἐλπίς because he was having troubles with צבי.<sup>112</sup> Others argued the translator took צבי as originating from the root צבה, which in Aramaic means “to want, wish” as he also did in 28:4, 5.<sup>113</sup> Part 2 §5.5, below, will offer a discussion of this issue. Here, the singu-

105. Judg 21:3; 1 Sam 14:41[2x]; 23:10, 11; 1 Kgs 8:23, 25, 26, 28; 2 Kgs 19:15; 1 Chr 29:10; 2 Chr 6:14, 16, 17; Ezra 9:15; Jdt 13:7; Bar 2:11.

106. כנף appears also in Isa 6:2[2x]; 18:1, where it respectively denotes the “wings” of “seraphim” and “boats or insects.” For a discussion of the meaning of the expression צלצל כנפים, see Hans Wildberger, *Jesaja* (BKAT 10/2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978), 679; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 19; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 308.

107. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:222; Liebmann, “Der Text,” 233.

108. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 40.

109. See François van Menxel, *Ελπίς. Espoir. Espérance. Etudes sémantiques et théologiques du vocabulaire de l'espérance dans l'Hellénisme et le Judaïsme avant le Nouveau Testament* (Publications Universitaires Européennes: Théologie 23/213; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1983), 250.

110. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 228.

111. There is a disagreement as to whether צדיק in Isa 24:16 is a divine epithet or a reference to the “godly.” For a recent discussion of this issue, see Wilson de Angelo Cunha, “A Brief Discussion of MT Isaiah 24,14–16,” *Bib* 90 (2009), 530–544.

112. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:223; Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 40.

113. Wilhelm Rudolph, *Jesaja 24–27* (BWANT 62; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933),

lar εὐσεβής “pious, godly” for the singular צדיק is interesting. In LXX Isaiah, εὐσεβής appears only in Isa 26:7; 32:9 [גדיב] (plural), while being rare in the rest of the LXX.<sup>114</sup> In Isa 26:7, the translator rendered the singular צדיק with the plural εὐσεβεῖς. This raises the question as to why he decided to use the singular εὐσεβής in 24:16. See part 2 §5.5, below.

The clause καὶ ἐροῦσιν οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον stands in place of באמר רזיילי רזיילי אוי לי בגדים בגדו ובגד בוגדים בגדו. Whereas MT reads “and I said,” LXX has “and they will say” (cf. discussion in n.103, above). LXX has reworked and shortened the rest of the verse considerably. The particle οὐαὶ translates אוי, but the words רזיילי רזיילי were dropped. The translator, by further dropping the pronominal suffix in the לי after אוי, reread the Hebrew as אוי לבגדים, translating it with οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν.<sup>115</sup> The participle οἱ ἀθετοῦντες translates the second participle בוגדים at the same time that בגדו/ובגד/בגדו were not formally translated. The equivalence ἀθετέω/בגד appears in Isa 21:2[2x]; 24:16[2x]; 33:1[2x]; 48:8[2x]. The expression τὸν νόμον is a plus in the LXX.<sup>116</sup>

24:17

MT: פחד ופחת ופח עליך יושב הארץ

Translation: “There are terror, and pit, and trap against you, o inhabitant of the earth.”

LXX: φόβος καὶ βόθρυος καὶ παγὶς ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

NETS: “Fear and pit and snare are upon you who dwell on the earth!”

LXX.D: “Schrecken und Grube und Falle über euch, die ihr auf der Erde wohnt!”

12. This definition of צבה is listed as II. צבה in HALOT, 3:997. Slightly different from Rudolph, Leonard H. Brockington (“The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in ΔΟΞΑ,” VT 1 [1951]: 29) advanced that the Hebrew was read via Aramaic צבו/צבותא “will, desire.”

114. Arie van der Kooij, “The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Issue of Coherence. A Two-fold Analysis of LXX Isaiah 31:9b–32:8” in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives; Papers Read at the Conference on the Septuagint of Isaiah, Held in Leiden 10-11 April 2008* (ed. Arie van der Kooij and Michäel N. van der Meer; CBET 55; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 44.

115. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 229.

116. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 236; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 228.

The differences between MT and LXX are the plural forms ὑμᾶς/ἐνοικοῦντας in LXX for the singular יושב/עליך in MT.<sup>117</sup> Contrast LXX Isa 24:17 with the singular addressee in LXX Jer 31:43.

24:18

MT: והיה הנס מקול הפחד יפל אל־הפחת והעולה מתוך הפחת ילכד  
בפח כִּי־ארבות ממרום נפתחו וירעשו מוסדי ארץ

Translation: “And it will be that the one fleeing from the sound of terror will fall in the pit and the one climbing out of the pit will be taken by the trap because the windows of<sup>118</sup> the height have been opened and the foundations of the earth have been shaken.”

LXX: καὶ ἔσται ὁ φεύγων τὸν φόβον ἐμπεσεῖται εἰς τὸν βόθυνον ὁ δὲ ἐκβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ βοθύνου ἀλώσεται ὑπὸ τῆς παγίδος ὅτι θυρίδες ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἡνεώχθησαν καὶ σεισθήσεται τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς

NETS: “And it shall be that the one who flees from the fear shall fall into the pit, and the one who gets out of the pit shall be caught by the snare, because windows have been opened out of heaven, and the foundations of the earth will be shaken.”

LXX.D: “Und es wird geschehen, dass, wer vor dem Schrecken flieht, in die Grube fällt, wer aber aus der Grube herauskommt, von der Falle gefangen wird, denn die Fenster an *Himmel* wurden geöffnet, und die Fundamente der Erde *werden* beben.”

117. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 252.

118. It is claimed (IBHS §9.8c) that the particle מ attached to מרום is an example of what is called “enclitic *mem*.” This particle was usually attached to the end of a word and in the process of transmission of the Hebrew text it became confused with “other common morphemes formed with *mem* such as the masculine plural suffix *-im*, the pronominal suffix *-ām*, the inseparable preposition *min*, etc.” (IBHS §9.8a). This particle originally functioned as a genitive (IBHS §9.8a) and “most common are its uses in the middle of the construct chain” (IBHS §9.8b). Thus, IBHS §9.8c proposes an emendation of MT Isa 24:18 into מרום ארבות־ים and a translation “the windows *of* heaven are opened” (emphasis added) as NIV and NRSV do. Consequently, Bosman and van Grol’s translation (“Annotated Translation of Isaiah 24–27,” 6) as “the floodgates *in* the height are opened” (emphasis added) seems improper.

מקול “from the sound of” is a minus in LXX Isaiah. Liebmann denied that the translator’s *Vorlage* lacked the expression מקול, attributing its absence in the LXX to the translator’s decision to avoid a Hebraism.<sup>119</sup> A new study of LXX Isaiah’s translation style has indicated that the translator tends to omit a noun in a genitival relationship.<sup>120</sup> I would add the omission of מקול as one of those cases. Against das Neves,<sup>121</sup> the preposition ἐκ must be seen as a translation of מתוך “from the middle of.”

The Greek τοῦ οὐρανοῦ “of heaven” in 18f renders ממרום “from the height.” Liebmann suggested that other places, where the phrases ארבות השמים or ארבות בשמים appear (Gen 7:11; 8:2; 2 Kgs 7:2, 19; Mal 3:10), might have played a role in LXX Isa 24:18f.<sup>122</sup> Following Liebmann’s suggestion, it appears that the use of οὐρανός in LXX Isa 24:18f is the result of a harmonization with LXX Gen 7:11: καὶ οἱ καταρράκται τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἡνεώχθησαν, because τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἡνεώχθησαν also occurs in LXX Isa 24:18. The translator was led to LXX Gen 7:11 because MT Gen 7:11 and MT Isa 24:18 have similar expressions: וארבת נפתחו השמים in Gen 7:11 and ארבות ממרום נפתחו in Isa 24:18.<sup>123</sup> The indicative וירעשו “and they shook” is rendered by the singular (not unusual, cf. θεμέλια) future passive σεισθήσεται “will be shaken.” The pair σείω/רעש appears here and in Isa 13:13; 14:16; 29:6. The passive is due to the translator’s interpretation of the idea conveyed by the Hebrew.

24:19

רעה התרעעה הארץ פור התפוררה ארץ מוט התמוטטה ארץ

Translation: “The earth has certainly<sup>124</sup> split up,<sup>125</sup> the earth has certainly broken apart, the earth has certainly swayed.”

119. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 240; also das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 252.

120. Van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 69–71.

121. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 252.

122. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 241. Besides Gen 7:11, Ottley (*Isaiah*, 2:223) points to Ps 18:15; 78:23. Although the phrase καὶ θύρας οὐρανοῦ ἀνέωξεν in Ps 77:23 is very similar to LXX Isa 24:19 θυρίδες ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἡνεώθησαν, it is not possible to establish any dependence of one passage on the other because they differ in their use of θύρα (Ps 77:23) and θυρίς (Isa 24:19).

123. Das Neves (*A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 252) noted that מרום is usually rendered by ὑψηλός and not οὐρανός in LXX Isaiah. However, he dismissed commenting further on the use of οὐρανός in LXX 24:18 because, in his view, “ambas as expressões se equivalem no grego bíblico.”

124. In the *qal* inf. abs. of geminate verbs the last consonant usually drops as, for example, קב in Num 23:25 and של in Ruth 2:16 (GK §67o). Based on this, GKC §67o



LXX: παραχρή παραχθήσεται ἡ γῆ, καὶ ἀπορία ἀπορηθήσεται ἡ γῆ

NETS: “The earth will be troubled with trouble, and the earth will be perplexed with perplexity.”

LXX.D: “Die Erde wird tief erschüttert werden, und ohne jeden Ausweg wird die Erde sein.”

The main difference between LXX and MT is the number of clauses. MT is a longer text, containing three clauses, whereas LXX is a shorter text with two clauses.<sup>126</sup> This two-clause construction is clearly stylistic in nature, probably in the light of Isa 24:3, which similarly uses only two clauses in connection with the “earth” (cf. discussion under Isa 24:3 in part 2 §5.1, below).

The expression παραχρή παραχθήσεται ἡ γῆ stands in place of רעה התרעעה הארץ. The LXX’s translation with the verb παράσσω “to stir up” does not correspond well with the Hebrew רעע “to break.”<sup>127</sup> Why did the translator employ παραχρή παραχθήσεται here? One of the reasons is his concern for style. The repeated –τ/χ sound imitates his *Vorlage*’s emphasis on the sound –ת/ר. The same concern for style explains the translator’s choice of ἀπορία ἀπορηθήσεται for פור התפורר. It is clear that the translator retained his *Vorlage*’s emphasis on the sound πορ/פור.<sup>128</sup> As the equivalence ἀπορέω/פר appears only here in the whole of the LXX, it follows that ἀπορέω does not correspond well to פר<sup>129</sup> (cf. the equivalence διασασδάζω/פר in Isa 8:10; 14:27; 44:25). Why did he not employ διασασδάζω in Isa 24:19? One answer is his concern to imitate the sound of his source text. However, it is not clear how that concern affected

---

judges רעה in Isa 24:19 as “quite abnormal” and sees it as probably the result of dittography, while HALOT claims it to be a “textual error” for רע on the basis of רוע in 1QIsa<sup>b</sup>. A word of caution should be said here: the form רע is found in the Bible only five times and always as a finite verb (Num 1:10; 22:34; Josh 24:15; Prov 24:18; Jer 40:4). The presence of the consonant ה at the end of רעה could be explained as alliteration, because the same verbal root immediately following both starts and ends in ה. In any case, GKC §113w claims that רעה in Isa 24:19 “must also, according to the Masora, certainly be the infinitive absolute Qal.”

125. In Classical Hebrew, although inf. abs. are usually used with verbs of the same stem, the *qal* inf. abs. can also appear together with verbs of a different stem (cf. Joüon §123p; IBHS §35.2.1d). Isaiah 24:19 is an example of a *qal* (רעה) inf. abs. used with a verb of a different stem, which, in this case, is the *hithpolel* התרעעה.

126. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:223.

127. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 252. Cf. θράω “to break” in θ’.

128. Scholz, *Jesaias*, 32; Jan de Waard, “‘Homophony’ in the Septuagint,” *Bib* 62 (1981), 556.

129. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 253.



his lexical choice of ἀπορέω here.<sup>130</sup> For more on this issue, see part 2 §5.6, below.

24:20

MT: נוע תנוע ארץ כשכור והתנוודדה כמלונה וכבד עליה פשעה ונפלה  
ולא־תסיף קום

Translation: “The earth will certainly totter like the drunken, it will sway back and forth like the hut. As her transgression has been heavy against her, she will fall and will not stand up again.”

LXX: ἔκλινε καὶ σεισθήσεται ὡς ὀπωροφυλάκιον ἡ γῆ ὡς ὁ μεθύων καὶ κραιπαλῶν καὶ πεσεῖται καὶ οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἀναστῆναι, κατίσχυσε γὰρ ἐπ’ αὐτῆς ἡ ἀνομία

NETS: “The earth has bent over, and it will be shaken like a garden-watcher’s hut, like the one who drinks too much and is intoxicated, and it will fall and will not be able to rise, for lawlessness has prevailed upon it.”

LXX.D: “es wankete [20] *und* es wird beben die Erde wie eine Wächterhütte, wie der Betrunkene und *Berauschte*, und wird fallen und nicht imstande sein aufzustehen, *denn die* Gesetzlosigkeit hat sie *überwältigt*.”

As for ἔκλινε “it has tipped over,” one opinion is that it translates נוע.<sup>131</sup> However, the pair κλίνω/נוע is found nowhere else in the LXX. Another proposal was that ἔκλινε had no counterpart in the translator’s *Vorlage*.<sup>132</sup> Contrarily,

130. De Waard, “Homophony,” 556: “The phonological translation in the case of the repeated פור/πορ is evident. However, it is far more difficult to demonstrate in which way the phonological translation has affected the lexical one.”

131. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 243, 244. Liebmann (244) noticed that the past tense ἔκλινεν (20a) followed by the fut. tense phrase καὶ σεισθήσεται (20b) was striking. In comparison with the fut. tense translation of MT 20b, one would expect a corresponding rendition of MT 20a. Liebmann, then, conjectured that the letter nun of נוע in 20b must have dropped in the LXX’s *Vorlage* “sonst er es gewiss übersetzt” (244) and that the remaining word must have been read as the perfect νε. Liebmann’s conjectures would have been avoided had he realized that ἔκλινεν is a rendition of the verb הִתְמוֹטֵט in 19c and not of MT 20a as he thought.

132. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 241; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 253.

it is plausible that the translator interpreted the image of the earth “tottering, wavering” in the phrase מוט התמוטטה (24:19) as leading to the “tipping over” of the earth.<sup>133</sup> This is even more probable as the Hebrew portrays the earth as “falling” and as “not being able to stand up again” at the end of verse 20. The word ארץ in the last clause of verse 19 was condensed.

The one word σεισθήσεται “it will be shaken” stands for the image of the earth being shaken in the expressions נוע תנוע “it will be shaken” and והתנדדה “and it will sway back and forth.” The expression ὡς ὁπωροφυλάκιον “like a garden-watcher’s hut” translates כמלונה “like the hut” (see also Isa 1:8) while ἡ γῆ stands for ארץ. The expression ὡς ὁ μεθύων καὶ κραιπαλῶν “like the one who drinks and is overpowered by wine” must be seen as an explication of כשכור “like the drunkard.” Compare the pair μεθύω/שכור in Isa 19:14 and κραιπαλάω/שכר in Isa 29:9.

The translator changed the order of the last two sentences of vers. 20. The expressions καὶ πεσεῖται καὶ οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἀναστῆναι translate MT’s last sentence ונפלה ולא־תסיף קום. The last clause of the LXX, κατίσχυσεν γὰρ ἐπ’ αὐτῆς ἡ ἀνομία, renders MT’s וכבד עליה פשעה.<sup>134</sup> The pronominal suffix in פשעה is not translated for stylistic concisiveness (cf. Isa 24:2, above).<sup>135</sup> Important here is the translator’s use of γὰρ for ו and ἀνομία for פשע. The reasons for the translator’s choices will be discussed in part 2 §5.6, below.

## 24:21

MT: והיה ביום ההוא יפקד יהוה על־צבא המרום במרום ועל־מלכי האדמה על־האדמה

Translation: “And it will be in that day that Yahweh will punish the host of the high ones on high and the kings of the land on the land.”

LXX: καὶ ἐπάξει ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὴν χεῖρα καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς

NETS: “And God will bring his hand against the ornament of heaven and against the kings of the earth.”

133. LXX.D; van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 208. See also the equivalence κλίνω/מוט in LXX Ps 45:7; 103:5, and θ’s translation of מוט התמוטטה in v. 19 with κλινόμενη κλειθήσεται.

134. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 244.

135. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 253–54.

LXX.D: “Und Gott wird *die Hand* erheben gegen die *Ordnung des Himmels* und gegen die Könige der Erde.”

It has been argued that the translator’s *Vorlage* lacked **היה ביום ההוא** because it is not part of the translator’s style to leave out longer sentences.<sup>136</sup> However, it is unlikely that the phrase **היה ביום ההוא** was already absent in the translator’s *Vorlage* as all the ancient witnesses align with MT.<sup>137</sup> Part 2 §5.7, below, will entertain a discussion for the nonattestation of **היה ביום ההוא**, arguing that the translator may have deliberately dropped it. For now, it must be noted that the conjunction *καί* is a translation of the **ו** in **והיה**.

The expression *ἐπάξει ... τῇ χειρᾷ* for **יפקד** is interesting. It has been argued that the use of *ἐπάγω* is not a literal translation of **פקד** as one would expect the verb *πῆγνυμι* “to position firmly.”<sup>138</sup> Das Neves’s suggestion is difficult as the equivalence *πῆγνυμι/פקד* does not occur in the LXX. It is important to note that, while **פקד** is rendered with *ἐπισκεπτομαι* “to take interest in” in the LXX, that equivalence does not occur in Isaiah. Instead, **פקד** is rendered periphrastically with *ἐπισκοπή* “the act of taking interest” in Isa 23:17; 24:22; 29:6. Contrarily, the equivalence *ἐπάγω/פקד* appears five times in LXX Isaiah out of a total of seven occurrences in the LXX (Isa 10:12; 24:21; 26:14; 26:21; 27:1; Exod 32:34; 34:7). A look at these passages will reveal that the translator used *ἐπάγω* in Isa 24:21 because of the construction **על ... פקד**, which he invariably translates with *ἐπάγω + ἐπί*. For the more interesting addition of “the hand,” see the discussion in part 2 §5.6, below.

The use of *ὁ θεός* as a rendition of **יהוה** is also uncommon in this chapter because the latter is usually translated with *κύριος* (vv. 1, 14, 15). For now, see *ἐπάξει ὁ θεός* in Isa 27:1.

The phrase *τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* “the ornament of heaven” stands in place of **צבא המרום במרום** “the host of the high ones on high.” *Τὸν κόσμον* is here a translation of **צבא**,<sup>139</sup> even though *κόσμος* does not usually render **צבא** in the LXX; it is only used in five places (Gen 2:1; Deut 4:19; 17:3; Isa 24:21; 40:26). While one scholar argued that the translator’s source text lacked **במרום**, another stated that the translator omitted it.<sup>140</sup> A different *Vorlage* is implau-

136. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 246.

137. *α, σ, θ' και εσται εν τη ημερα εκείνη*, Targ. **ויהי בעידן ההוא**, and Vulg. *et erit in die illa*. Pesh. ܐܠܗܝܬܐ lacks an equivalent for **והיה**.

138. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 260.

139. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 47.

140. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 246; Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:223.

sible as all the ancient witnesses attest to **במרום**.<sup>141</sup> To say that the translator omitted the phrase in question may be too strong because **במרום** is implied in the expression **τοῦ οὐρανοῦ**. Thus it seems more plausible to say that the translator condensed his *Vorlage*. He did the same with **על־האדמה**, an expression that is already implied in **τῆς γῆς**. **Οὐρανός** does not render **מרום** except in LXX Isa 24:18, 21 (cf. comments on v. 18, above). The question arises as to why the translator used the expression **τὸν λόσον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ** for **צבא המרום** **במרום**. See part 2 §5.7, below, for a discussion.

24:22

MT: **ואספו אספה אסיר על־בור וסגרו על־מסגר ומרב ימים יפקדו**

Translation: “And they will be gathered together *like* prisoners into the pit and they will be shut up in the dungeon and after many days they will be judged.”

LXX: **καὶ συνάξουσιν καὶ ἀποκλείουσιν εἰς ὄχυρῶμα καὶ εἰς δεσμωτήριον, διὰ πολλῶν γενεῶν ἐπισκοπή ἔσται αὐτῶν**

NETS: “And they will gather them together and shut them up in a fortress and in a prison; after many generations will be their visitation.”

LXX.D: “Und *man* wird (sie) sammeln und wegsperren in eine Festung und in ein Gefängnis, *durch viele Generationen hindurch* wird ihre Heimsuchung *währen*.”

The expression **καὶ συνάξουσιν** “and they will gather” translates **ואספו** (24:22a), which the translator read as an active verb instead of MT’s passive form.<sup>142</sup> Similarly, **ἀποκλείουσιν** “they will shut” indicates that the translator read MT’s passive **וסגרו** as an active verb.<sup>143</sup> The expression **εἰς ὄχυρῶμα** “into a fortress” seems to translate **על־בור** “in the pit.” For the equivalence **ὄχυρῶμα/בור**, see Gen 41:14. If this were the case, then the words **אסיר/אספה** were

141. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> **על־צבא המרום במרום**, Targ. **חילות תוקפא דיתבין בתוקפא** (interpretive), Pesh. **ܥܠܥܒܐ ܡܪܘܡܐ ܡܪܘܡܐ**, and Vulg. *super militiam caeli in excelso*.

142. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 247, 249; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 260.

143. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 260.

either left untranslated<sup>144</sup> or the translator condensed them into εἰς ὀχύρωμα.<sup>145</sup> In the expression καὶ εἰς δεσμοτήριον, while the conjunction καὶ is a plus, εἰς δεσμοτήριον seems to stand for על-מסגר.<sup>146</sup> The expression ἐπισκοπή ἔσται translates יפקדו.<sup>147</sup> For the equivalence ἐπισκοπή ἔσται/פקד in the future tense, see Isa 29:6; Num 16:29. The term αὐτῶν “them” is a plus in the LXX and its function will be discussed in part 2 §5.7, below.

24:23

MT: וחפרה הלבנה ובושה החמה כי-מלך יהוה צבאות בהר ציון  
ובירושלם ונגד זקניו כבוד

Translation: “And the moon will be ashamed and the sun will feel ashamed because Yahweh of hosts has reigned in mount Zion and in Jerusalem and is glorious before his elders.”

LXX: καὶ τακῆσεται ἡ πλίνθος, καὶ πεσεῖται τὸ τεῖχος, ὅτι βασιλεύσει κύριος ἐν Σιων καὶ ἐν Ιερουσαλημ καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν πρεσβυτέρων δοξασθήσεται

NETS: “Then the brick will be dissolved, and the wall will fall, because the Lord will reign in Sion and in Ierousalem, and before the elders he will be glorified.”

LXX.D: “Und der Ziegel wird zerfallen, und die Mauer wird einstürzen, denn der Herr wird als König herrschen in Sion und in Jerusalem und vor den Ältesten verherrlicht werden.”

The phrase καὶ τακῆσεται ἡ πλίνθος “and the brick will be dissolved” stands in place of וחפרה הלבנה “and the moon will be ashamed.” It has been suggested that the translator read חפרה as הפרה from פרר “to break” due to a confusion of the similar letters ח and ה.<sup>148</sup> However, the pair τήκομαι/פרר does not appear anywhere else in the LXX. Another proposal is that the divergent reading καὶ τακῆσεται arose from mistakenly taking הלבנה “moon” as

144. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 248; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 260.

145. HUB. While 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> does not attest to אסיר, the latter seems to be attested in 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>.

146. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 260.

147. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 250.

148. Scholz, *Jesaias*, 29; Liebmann, “Der Text,” 251.

הַלְבִּנָּה “brick.”<sup>149</sup> A decision as to whether the phrase “and the brick will be dissolved” originated with a translator’s mistake will have to wait until part 2 §5.7, below.

The expression καὶ πεσεῖται τὸ τεῖχος “and the wall will fall” stands for ובושה החמה “and the sun will feel ashamed.” Τὸ τεῖχος indicates that the translator read MT חמה “sun” as ח[ו]מה “wall.”<sup>150</sup> It is important to notice that in the parallel passage Isa 30:26 the translator rendered הַלְבִּנָּה and חמה respectively as σελένη “moon” and ἥλιος “sun.”<sup>151</sup> These renditions show that the translator was well acquainted with the meanings of הַלְבִּנָּה and חמה as “moon” and “sun.” For some reason, however, he decided to read the same words in Isa 24:23 as “brick” and “wall.” While some argued the divergent readings in the LXX arose from a mistake, that question will have to wait until those readings are taken in their own right in part 2 §5.7, below. The combination of πίπτω and τεῖχος in Isa 24:23b also occurs in Isa 27:3 and 30:13, passages to be discussed in part 2 §5.7, below.

Finally, the past tense מלך “he reigned” was rendered with the future βασιλεύσει “he will reign.” Similarly, the noun כבוד was taken as a future passive verb: δοξασθήσεται “he will be glorified.” The pronominal suffix in “his elders” and the nouns צבאות, הר are not attested in the LXX,<sup>152</sup> which has only “the elders.” Part 2 §5.7, below, will further address some of the divergences noted here.

149. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:224.

150. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 251; Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:224; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 262; BHS.

151. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:224.

152. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 251.

# ISAIAH 25:1–12: A COMPARISON

25:1

MT: יהוה אלהי אתה ארוממך אודה שמך כי עשית פלא עצות מרחוק  
אמונה אמן

Translation: “Yahweh, you are my God, I will extol you, I will praise your name, because you have done wonderful *things*, counsels<sup>1</sup> from afar are firmly reliable.”

LXX: κύριε ὁ θεός μου δοξάσω σε ὑμνήσω τὸ ὄνομά σου ὅτι ἐποίησας θαυμαστὰ πράγματα βουλὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινὴν γένοιτο κύριε

NETS: “O Lord, my God, I will glorify you; I will sing hymns to your name, because you have done wonderful things—an ancient, true plan. May it be so, O Lord!”

LXX.D: “Herr, mein Gott, ich will dich verherrlichen, will deinen Namen rühmen, denn du hast wunderbare *Taten* getan, *einen* alten, zuverlässigen Ratschluss; *so sei es, Herr!*”

---

1. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> differs from MT in reading תצית for עצות. The ת is expected as the letters ץ and ת are frequently interchanged. This process had already started in late biblical books (cf. Millar Burrows, “Orthography, Morphology, and Syntax of the St. Mark’s Isaiah Manuscript,” *JBL* 68 [1949]: 202; Edward Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1 Q Isaa)* [STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974], 57, 221). As for the -yod, there is no clear explanation for it (cf. Kutscher, *The Language*, 221). Perhaps, the -yod was the result of confusion between the similar letters ך and ך in the scroll.

The phrase κύριε ὁ θεός μου “O Lord, my God” stands for יהוה אלהי אתה “Yahweh, you are my God.” In the LXX, the personal pronoun אתה was not translated. Whereas MT reads as a nonverbal clause, “Yahweh, you *are* my God,” LXX has a vocative phrase “O Lord, my God.” It is important to note that the phrase יהוה אלהי אתה appears only once more, in 1 Kgs 3:7, where it is translated as κύριε ὁ θεός μου σύ. Contrarily, the phrase κύριε ὁ θεός μου occurs several times in the LXX, translating יהוה אלהי (2 Sam 15:31; 1 Kgs 17:21; Tob 3:11; Ps 7:2, 4, 7; 12:4; 17:29; 29:3, 13; 34:24; 37:16 [MT אדני אלהי], 22; 39:6; 85:12 [MT אדני אלהי]; 103:1; 108:26; Odes 6:7; Jonah 2:7). It is possible that the translator was used to the stereotyped κύριε ὁ θεός μου.

The expression δοξάσω σε “I will glorify you” stands for ארוממך “I will exalt you.” The pair δοξάζω/רום is striking as it appears only in Isa 25:1; 33:10. In every other case in Isaiah, the lexeme רום is translated with ὑψόω (1:2; 13:2; 23:4; 30:18; 37:23; 40:9[2x]; 52:13[?]; 58:1). The rare pairing of δοξάζω/רום raises the question as to why the translator decided to employ it here. Part 2 §6.1, below, will discuss this issue further.

The expression ὅτι ἐποίησας θαυμαστά πράγματα “because you have performed wonderful affairs” translates כי עשית פלא. The plural θαυμαστά renders פלא several times in the LXX (Josh 3:5; Job 42:3; Ps 98:1; 106:22; 118:23; 119:129; Dan 12:6; Mic 7:15).<sup>2</sup> The phrase θαυμαστά πράγματα occurs only in LXX Isa 25:1, where πράγματα seems to be a plus.<sup>3</sup>

The phrase βουλὴν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινήν “an ancient, true plan” translates עצות מרחוק אמונה. The singular βουλή for the plural עצות is noticeable. עצה appears regularly in the singular and it is equally rendered with the singular of βουλή (Isa 5:19; 8:10; 11:2; 14:26; 19:3, 11, 17; 29:15; 30:1; 44:26; 46:10). The only exception is the plural עצתך (Isa 47:13), which was rendered with the plural ταῖς βουλαῖς σου. It has been stated that the singular βουλή was due to a necessity of the Greek language.<sup>4</sup> For more on βουλή, see part 2 §6.1, below.<sup>5</sup>

2. In the LXX, even when פלא is undoubtedly sing., it is translated with the pl. of θαυμάσιος/θαυμάσιος, cf. Ps 77:12, 15; 78:12; 88:11; 88:13; 89:6; Joel 2:26. The only exception is Ps 118:23, where the sing. נפלאות is rendered with the sing. θαυμαστή.

3. Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (SJSJ 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 285.

4. Jean M. Coste, “Le texte grec d’Isaïe XXV, 1–5,” *RB* 61 (1954), 38: “le passage du pluriel au singulier étant rendu nécessaire par l’usage différent des deux langues.”

5. Among the other ancient witnesses, while Pesh. ܡܠܚܝܢ probably attests to sing. “counsel,” Targ. מלכין and Vulg. *cogitationes* attest to pl. “counsels.”



The adjective ἀρχαῖος translates מרחוק.<sup>6</sup> In LXX Isaiah, μακράν “far-off” (Isa 5:26; 46:12; 57:19; 59:14), μακρόθεν “from afar” (Isa 60:4, 9), πόρρωθεν (Isa 33:13; 39:3; 43:6; 49:12), and πόρρω “to a distance” (Isa 22:3; 66:19) are used to translate רחוק. Isa 25:1 is the sole example of the equivalence ἀρχαῖος/רחוק in the LXX. It is clear that the translator took רחוק in a temporal sense with his choice of ἀρχαῖος as he did in Isa 22:11 (רחוק/ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς) and 30:27; 49:1 (מרחוק/ממרחק = διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ).<sup>7</sup>

As for ἀληθινήν, Shemaryahu Talmon argued that it translates אמן, which was vocalized as אִמֶּן.<sup>8</sup> However, his proposal must be rejected for the following reasons: First, as argued below, אמן vocalized as אִמֶּן is usually translated with γένοιτο. In contrast, the only other place where the equivalence אמן/ἀληθινός appears is Isa 65:16[2x]; second, although ἀληθινός renders אמונה only in Isa 25:1; 59:4, its cognate ἀλήθεια translates אמונה several times (Isa 11:5; 2 Chron 19:9; Ps 36:6; 40:11; 88:12; 89:2, 3, 6, 9, 25, 34, 50; 92:3; 96:13; 98:3; 100:5; 119:30, 75, 86, 90, 138; 143:1). And, third, the clause position of ἀληθινήν indicates that it translates אמונה instead of אמן; otherwise, one would have to argue that the translator skipped אמונה and translated אמן with ἀληθινήν and joined the latter together with βουλὴν ἀρχαίαν; and, then, he translated אמונה with γένοιτο κύριε but positioned this phrase at the end of the clause. Albeit possible, Talmon’s suggestion would require a cumbersome explanation of the Greek translation. It is simply better to see ἀληθινήν as a translation of אמונה, perhaps taken as feminine participle.<sup>9</sup>

Finally, in the phrase γένοιτο κύριε, γένοιτο translates אמן, which was probably read as אִמֶּן instead of MT’s אֱמֶן.<sup>10</sup> This claim is supported by the

6. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 38.

7. Arie van der Kooij, “Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta,” in *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik* (ed. Henning Graf Reventlow; VWGTh 11; Gütersloh: Kaiser/Gütersloher, 1997), 16; idem, “‘Wie heißt der Messias?’ Zu Jes 9,5 in den alten griechischen Versionen,” in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik; Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, and Christoph Levin; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 159; Ronald L. Troxel, “BOΥΛΗ and BOΥΛΕΥΕΙΝ in LXX Isaiah,” in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives; Papers Read at the Conference on the Septuagint of Isaiah, Held in Leiden 10–11 April 2008* (ed. Arie van der Kooij and Michäel N. van der Meer; CBET 55; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 158.

8. Shemaryahu Talmon, “Amen as an Introductory Oath Formula,” *Text 7* (1969): 128.

9. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 38.

10. Ernst Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaja 24–27,” *ZAW* 22 (1902): 34; 23 (1903): 253; Coste, “Le texte grec,” 38; J. C. M. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías (Cap. 24 de Isaías)* (Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973), 166; HUB.

various occurrences of γένοιτο as a rendition of אָמֵן in the LXX (Num 5:22; Deut 27:15–26; 1 Kgs 1:36; Ps 41:14; 72:19; 89:53; 106:48; Jer 11:5).<sup>11</sup> Κύριε has no counterpart in the Hebrew.<sup>12</sup> Seeligmann wondered whether γένοιτο κύριε was a liturgical invocation corresponding to אָמֵן in Jewish-Hellenistic worship. He pointed to Jer 3:19, where γένοιτο κύριε may correspond to אֵיד seen as an acrostical abbreviation for כִּי [הוּה] אָמֵן.<sup>13</sup> However, even if Seeligmann was correct about the acrostical nature of אֵיד as an abbreviation for אָמֵן כִּי [הוּה], it must be noted that in Isa 25:1 only אָמֵן appears. It would then be difficult to account for κύριε. Contrary to Seeligmann, Talmon argued that the translator's *Vorlage* contained the reading אָמֵן followed “by the abbreviated tetragrammaton indicated by the initial *he* only.” For him, אָמוֹנָה in MT, composed of אָמֵן followed by an abbreviation of the Tetragrammaton ה, represents this reading.<sup>14</sup> But Talmon's suggestion is problematic because of the letter ו in אָמוֹנָה. That the ו is problematic is clear from Talmon's suggestion that אָמוֹנָה, without ו, was behind γένοιτο κύριε in Jer 3:19.<sup>15</sup> See also part 2 §6.1, below, for another explanation.

25:2

MT: כִּי שָׁמַת מַעִיר לְגַל קָרְיָה בַצּוּרָה לְמַפְלָה אֶרְמוֹן זָרִים מַעִיר לְעוֹלָם  
לֹא יִבְנֶה

Translation: “Because you have turned *the* city into a heap of stones, the inaccessible town into ruin, the citadel of the strangers is no longer a city, it will never be rebuilt.”

LXX: ὅτι ἔθηκας πόλεις εἰς χῶμα πόλεις ὀχυράς τοῦ πεσεῖν αὐτῶν τὰ θεμέλια τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα οὐ μὴ οἰκοδομηθῇ

NETS: “Because you have made cities a heap, fortified cities, so their foundations might fall; the city of the impious will not be built forever.”

11. Talmon, “Amen,” 124n3.

12. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 38.

13. Isac Leo Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (MVEOL 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948), 101. See the same suggestions in BHK; BHS, HUB.

14. Talmon, “Amen,” 128.

15. Ibid.

LXX.D: “Denn du hast *Städte* in einem Erdhügel verwandelt, befestigte *Städte*, sodass ihre Fundamente einstürzten; die Stadt der Gottlosen wird gewiss nie mehr aufgebaut werden!”

The phrase ὅτι ἔθηκας πόλεις εἰς χῶμα “because you have made cities a heap” stands for *כי שמת מעיר לגל* “because you have turned the city into a heap.” It is not clear whether the translator’s *Vorlage* read *מעיר*. While 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> *מעיר* aligns with MT, Targ. קרוי, Pesh. ܡܝܬܝܬܐ, and Vulg. *civitatem* do not attest to the *-mem* in *מעיר*. Besides, LXX πόλεις and Targ. קרוי have plural “cities.” Proposals have varied, with some scholars suggesting that MT’s *מעיר* be read as *העיר*, *ערים*, or *עיר*.<sup>16</sup> Be that as it may, it is important to note that LXX has the plural πόλεις. A decision as to whether the translator’s *Vorlage* already contained plural “cities” will have to wait until part 2 §6.1, below, which will seek to ascertain if the LXX’s plural “cities” make sense in its literary context.

The expression πόλεις ὀχυράς τοῦ πεσεῖν αὐτῶν τὰ θεμέλια “fortified cities so that their foundations might fall” stands for *קריה בצורה למפלה* “[you have turned] the inaccessible town into ruin.” The plural πόλεις ὀχυράς translates the singular *קריה בצורה*. Why did the translator insert the plural “cities” here? Part 2 §6.1, below, will address this question. Another aspect is the phrase “so that their foundations might fall” in 25:2b. The Greek τοῦ πεσεῖν “to fall” relates to *למפלה* “ruin.” A proposal is that the translator read it as an infinitive construct of the verb *נפל* preceded by the preposition *ל*, possibly taking *-ה* as a pronominal suffix.<sup>17</sup> However, it is better to see τοῦ πεσεῖν as a paraphrase based on the translator’s interpretation of *למפלה*.<sup>18</sup> But it is still important to ask the question as to why the translator employed *πίπτω* “to fall” here. Part 2 §6.1, below, will entertain this question further.

The Greek αὐτῶν τὰ θεμέλια is a rendition of the Hebrew *ארמון* as there is evidence for the equivalence *θεμέλιον/ארמון* in other LXX texts (Jer 6:5; Hos 8:14; Amos 1:4, 7, 10, 12, 14; 2:2, 5).<sup>19</sup> The translator inserted the plural αὐτῶν

16. BHK *העיר*; BHS *ערים* respectively. Arie van der Kooij (“Isaiah 24–27: Text-Critical Notes,” in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27: The Isaiah Workshop–De Jesaja Werkplaats* [ed. Hendrik Jan Bosman et al.; OtSt 43; Leiden: Brill, 2000]), 13) proposed the reading *עיר*: “MT does not make sense; error probably due to the same word in v. 2c.”

17. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 40. As B reads τοῦ μὴ πεσεῖν, previous scholars had argued that the translator read *למפלה* as composed of a *מן* *privativum* + *נפל*, cf. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 254; Johann Fischer, *In Welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaías den LXX vor?* (BZAW 56; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930), 40.

18. Richard R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint* (Codex Alexandrinus) (London: Clay & Sons, 1904–1906), 2:224.

19. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 254, 255; Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 52; Coste, “Le texte grec,” 40; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 166; HUB. Seeligmann saw

because he took ארמון with קריה בצורה למפלה. Differently in MT, ארמון goes with זרים מעיר.<sup>20</sup> As such, the plural αὐτῶν was used in agreement with its antecedent plural πόλεις ὄχυράς. Having taken ארמון with what preceded it, the translator decided to read מעיר in a genitival relation with זרים, rendering this phrase with τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλεις.<sup>21</sup> The rendition of זר with the Greek ἀσεβής occurs only in LXX Isa 25:2, 5; 29:5; ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν renders מזרם in Isa 25:4. Otherwise, the Greek ἀλλότριος (Isa 1:7[2x]; 43:12) and ἀλλογενής (Isa 61:5) usually render Hebrew זר.<sup>22</sup> It has been suggested that the translator's *Vorlage* read זדים "arrogant ones."<sup>23</sup> However, all the ancient witnesses align with MT.<sup>24</sup> Another proposal is that the translator misread זרים "strangers" for זדים "arrogant ones."<sup>25</sup> However, this is unlikely as nowhere else in the LXX does the pair ἀσεβής/זר occur.<sup>26</sup> The question as to whether ἀσεβής was a

in the diversity of terms employed for translating ארמון in the LXX evidence that the term in question had "disappeared from that Hebrew which was to the Jewish-Hellenistic community a living language."

20. Arie van der Kooij, "The Cities of Isaiah 24–27 According to the Vulgate, Targum and the Septuagint," in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27: The Isaiah Workshop–De Jesaja Werkplaats* (ed. Hendrik Jan Bosman et al.; *OtSt* 43; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 192.

21. Liebmann, "Der Text," 255; Arie van der Kooij, "Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions," in *As Those Who Are Taught: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL* (ed. Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull; *SBLSymS* 27; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 63; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 124.

22. Van der Kooij, "The Cities of Isaiah 24–27," 192.

23. Liebmann, "Der Text," 255. See also Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 40; Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA 12/3; Münster: Aschendorffsche, 1934), 82. Coste ("Le texte grec," 40) took an intermediate position, recognizing that ἀσεβής was caused "sans doute" by a confusion between זר/ד, but argued also for "traduction spiritualisante" of זרים. He further rightly pointed out that ἀσεβής nowhere in the LXX renders either זר or זד (for the latter claim, cf. Liebmann "Der Text," 255). Coste's latter claim is important and it will be discussed later; his intermediate position culminated in das Neves's claim (*A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 167) that "a palavra ἀσεβῶν deve-se à releitura do original זרים (‘estrangeiros, pagãos’) por זדים." For him, the reading ἀσεβῶν was due to the translator's interpretation of זרים as זדים and not to the presence of the latter in the LXX *Vorlage*, as Liebmann, Fischer, and Ziegler had argued. Different from BHK and BHS, the HUB noted that זרים was probably read as זדים. This difference in explanation in editions of the Hebrew Bible points to a move from a text-critical to an interpretative paradigm. Rather than taking the LXX text as a witness to establish the Hebrew text, LXX Isaiah is more and more used as a witness to how its *Vorlage* was read.

24. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> זרים, Pesh. ܙܪܝܡ, and Vulg. *alienorum*. The Targ. is highly interpretive at this point.

25. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 40; Coste, "Le texte grec," 40.

26. Van der Kooij, "The Cities of Isaiah 24–27," 192n16. In LXX Isa 13:11, ἀνομος

mistake will be picked up in part 2 §6.1, below. Finally, the clause εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα οὐ μὴ οἰκοδομηθῇ renders the Hebrew closely.

25:3

MT: עַל־כֵּן יִכְבְּדוּךָ עַם־עַז קְרִית גּוֹיִם עֲרִיצִים יִירָאוּךָ

Translation: “Therefore, a strong people will honor you, the town of the violent nations will be afraid of you.”

LXX: διὰ τοῦτο εὐλογήσῃ σε ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός καὶ πόλεις ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων εὐλογήσουσί σε

NETS: “Therefore the poor people will bless you, and cities of ill-treated persons will bless you.”

LXX.D: “Darum wird dich das arme Volk preisen, und Städte von Menschen, denen Unrecht geschieht, werden dich preisen.”

Other than here, εὐλογέω renders כָּבַד only in Isa 43:20 in the whole of the LXX. Its singular use is due to the singular λαός in the same clause. As for יִרָא, this word is never translated by εὐλογέω excepting here. The phrase ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός stands in place of עַם־עַז “strong, defiant people.” A commonplace explanation in the scholarly literature is that πτωχός was due to a confusion between the letters ט and י resulting in the word עֲנִי.<sup>27</sup> Part 2 §6.1, below, will address the issue as to whether “poor” was a mistake or not.

The phrase καὶ πόλεις ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων “and the cities of ill-treated persons” is in place of קְרִית גּוֹיִם עֲרִיצִים “the town of violent nations.” The conjunction καὶ is a plus. As in Isa 25:2 above, the plural “cities” stands for the singular “city/town” in MT. As for ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων as a translation of עֲרִיצִים, it must be noted that in LXX Isaiah other terms such as ἄνομος “unlawful” (Isa 29:20), ὑπερήφανος “arrogant” (Isa 13:11) and ἰσχύω “to be strong” (Isa 49:25) translate עָרִיץ.<sup>28</sup> The varied lexemes for עָרִיץ in LXX Isaiah

renders Τῷ, while ὑπερήφανος translates it in most of its other occurrences (e.g., Ps 119:21, 51, 69, 78, 122).

27. Anton Scholz, *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias* (Würzburg: Woerl, 1880), 30; Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:225; Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 40; Coste, “Le texte grec,” 40, 41; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 125n206.

28. Outside LXX Isaiah, עָרִיץ is usually rendered with λοιμός “pernicious, dangerous”

led a scholar to suggest the translator had some difficulties with it.<sup>29</sup> However, the translator's use of ἰσχύω in Isa 49:25 shows he knew the meaning of עריץ as denoting someone powerful much in line with other translations as δυνάστης and κραταιός in the LXX. Another proposal is that the translator read עריצים as the passive ערוצים.<sup>30</sup> However, the passive of ערץ is unattested in both Biblical and Qumran Hebrew. The question arises as to why the translator decided to use ἀδικουμένων here (see also 25:4). A tentative answer will be offered in part 2 §6.1, below.

As for ἀνθρώπων, while das Neves linked it to גוים, Coste had previously rejected that idea.<sup>31</sup> It is not possible, however, to determine definitively whether ἀνθρώπων was a translation of גוים, which would be the only example in the whole of the LXX, or of עריצים, in which case the latter would have been translated doubly by the phrase ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων. Slightly against das Neves is the fact that ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων stands in place of עריצים in Isa 25:4. But even this example is not decisive because it is possible to argue that the translator inserted ἀνθρώπων without any connection to his *Vorlage* given his emphasis on ἄνθρωπος in LXX Isa 25:1–5 (cf. vv. 3, 4 [2x], 5).<sup>32</sup>

25:4

MT: כִּי־הָיִיתָ מַעוֹז לְדָל מַעוֹז לְאִבְיוֹן בְּצַר־לּוֹ מַחֲסֵה מִזֶּרֶם צֶל מַחֲרָב כִּי  
רוּחַ עֲרִיצִים כֶּזֶרֶם קִיר

Translation: “Because you became a refuge for the poor, a refuge for the needy during his distress, a shelter from the heavy rain, a shadow from the heat, when the breath of the tyrants *was* like the rain *against* the wall,”

LXX: ἐγένου γὰρ πάσῃ πόλει ταπεινῇ βοηθὸς καὶ τοῖς ἀθυμήσασιν δι’ ἔνδειαν σκέπη ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν ῥύσῃ αὐτοὺς σκέπη διψώντων καὶ πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων

(Jer 15:21; Ezek 28:7; 30:11; 31:12; 32:12), δυνάστης “powerful” (Job 6:23; 15:20; 27:13), κραταιός “mighty” (Ps 54:5; 86:14), and, as in Isa 49:25, with ἰσχύω “to be strong” (Jer 20:11).

29. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 41.

30. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:225; Coste, “Le texte grec,” 41.

31. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 167; Coste, “Le texte grec,” 41. Troxel (*LXX-Isaiah*, 125) also thought ἀνθρώπων translated גוים. His reference to גוים “in v. 5” must be seen as a typo because גוים does not appear in 25:5 but in 25:3.

32. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 82.

NETS: “For you have become a helper to every humble city and a shelter to those who are dispirited because of poverty; you will rescue them from evil persons—a shelter for the thirsty and breath for ill-treated persons”

LXX.D: “Denn du wurdest *jeder niedrigen Stadt* ein Helfer und denen, *die wegen Bedürftigkeit verzagten*, ein Schutz, von *bösen Menschen wirst du sie retten*, (du) Schutz der *Durstigen und Lebensgeist der Menschen, denen Unrecht geschieht*.”

The sentence *מַעוֹן לְדָל בְּיַהֲיִיתָ* stands in place of *ἐγένου γὰρ πάσης πόλει ταπεινῇ βοηθός* (4a). *Πάσης πόλει* is a plus in the LXX. Liebmann saw in *πόλει* evidence for *לְעִיר* in the LXX *Vorlage* because, in his view, it is impossible to explain the word *πόλει* in relation to Hebrew *מַעוֹן*.<sup>33</sup> Contrary to Liebman, Ottley explained *πόλει* as the result of confusion by the translator, who read the word *עִיר* into *מַעוֹן*.<sup>34</sup> Fischer suggested that the translator took *מַעוֹן* in the sense of the Aramaic *מַחוּזָא* “Stadt.”<sup>35</sup> Coste thought the translator possibly confused “*ma’ōz* (refuge) et *ma’ir* (*πόλει*).”<sup>36</sup> Liebmann’s suggestion of a different *Vorlage* has to be rejected as there is no textual evidence supporting his claim. Ottley’s and Coste’s explanations are possible as the letters י and ו could be easily confused. However, their reasoning would not account for the letter ז in *מַעוֹן* because ז and ר are not so similar. Fischer’s position is too much of a stretch. It is more appropriate to take *πάσης πόλει* as the translator’s intentional insertion for contextual reasons (cf. “cities” in 25:2). The translator’s decision to use *πάσης πόλει* was, however, no mistake or accident because the equivalence *ῥαῦμα/מַעוֹן* found in Isa 23:14 shows he was acquainted with *מַעוֹן* as

33. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 258.

34. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:225. He was followed by Coste (“Le texte grec,” 42) and das Neves (*A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 168).

35. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 40. Marcus Jastrow (*Dictionary of Targumim, Talmud and Midrashic Literature* [New York: Judaica, 1985], 96) defined the Aramaic *מַחוּזָא* as (1) “harbor, trading place,” and (2) “large town.”

36. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 42; cf. also das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 168. Troxel’s (*LXX-Isaiah*, 125) claim that Coste concluded “that the translator derived *πάσης πόλει* in v. 4 from a *Vorlage* that read *מַעוֹן לְדָל* rather than *מַעוֹן לְדָל*” must be revised. Coste did admit to a possible confusion between *מַעוֹן* and *מַעִיר* but this confusion does not reflect a different *Vorlage*. For him, the translator was responsible for it, as is clear from his comments on the second *מַעוֹן* where he said that the translator had now read this second *מַעוֹן* correctly: “correctement lu, cette fois.” But the important point here is that Troxel seemed to have thought of a possible confusion between ז/ר that led to the reading *מַעִיר* *מַעוֹן* (cf. *LXX-Isaiah*, 118n173; p. 125).



“refuge.” The word *ταπεινῇ* in the dative case relates to the Hebrew לִדְלִי (LXX Isa 11:4; 26:6; Zeph 3:12).<sup>37</sup> The word *βοηθός* is a translation of double מַעֲזוּ (LXX Isa 17:10; Ps 52:9).<sup>38</sup>

The expression *καὶ τοῖς ἀθυμῆσασιν δι’ ἔνδειαν σκέπη* renders לִאֲבִיּוֹן בְּצַר־לוֹ מַחֲסָה. The conjunction *καί* is a plus. The phrase *τοῖς ἀθυμῆσασιν δι’ ἔνδειαν* is a paraphrase of לִאֲבִיּוֹן בְּצַר־לוֹ.<sup>39</sup> Ziegler conjectured that the translator could have read אֲבִיּוֹן in the light of the verb אָבַד and used *ἀθυμέω* as its equivalent.<sup>40</sup> There is no example, however, for the equivalence *ἀθυμέω/אָבַד* in the LXX. The word *σκέπη* renders מַחֲסָה.

The clause *ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν ῥύσῃ αὐτούς* (25:4c) relates to מְזֻרָם צֶל. It seems that *ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν* connects to מְזֻרָם, perhaps read as מְזֻרָמִים.<sup>41</sup> It has been suggested that *ῥύσῃ* links to מַחֲסָה because, in Isa 14:32, the synonymic *σώζω* translates חָסָה “to seek refuge.”<sup>42</sup> It seems best, however, to see *ῥύσῃ* as a translation of צֶל which the translator associated with נִצַּל.<sup>43</sup> As for *αὐτούς*, it must be seen as a plus which the translator introduced in analogy with the plural “every humble city” and “those who are feeling despondent” at the beginning of 25:4.<sup>44</sup>

The phrase *σκέπη διψώντων* relates to צֶל מַחֲרָב, where *σκέπη* is a translation of צֶל (Isa 16:3; 49:2). In this case, the translator possibly read צֶל in two different ways, as from נִצַּל, as discussed in the previous paragraph, and as “shadow” in the sense of “refuge.” *Διψώντων* “thirsting” clearly translates חָרַב “dryness, drought” here and in 25:5 below.<sup>45</sup> *Καὶ πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπων ἀδικοῦμένων* relates to כִּי רוּחַ עֲרִיצִים.<sup>46</sup> *Καί* is a plus. For כִּיר בּוֹרֵם, see the discussion on 25:5 below.

37. Coste (“Le texte grec,” 42) claimed that the ל in דל was not taken into consideration: “le lamed qui précède cet adjectif n’étant pas pris en considération.” See also Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 126. But it seems to me that the dative case in *ταπεινῇ* reflects the *lamed* even if the Greek definite article is not present.

38. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:225; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 112–113; Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, “The Old Greek of Isaiah,” 198.

39. Liebmann “Der Text,” 258; Coste, “Le texte grec,” 42.

40. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 83.

41. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 82; Coste, “Le texte grec,” 42; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 125.

42. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 126.

43. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:225; Coste, “Le texte grec,” 43. Perhaps, the translator took the ׀ in מְזֻרָם together with צֶל (= participle מִצַּל from נִצַּל).

44. Troxel’s (*LXX-Isaiah*, 124) claim that *ῥύσῃ αὐτούς* lacks an equivalent in MT is only partly correct because only *αὐτούς* is a plus, while *ῥύσῃ* is linked to צֶל.

45. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 225; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 82. For a fuller discussion, cf. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 43.

46. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 40; Coste, “Le texte grec,” 43.



25:5

MT: כחרב בציון שאון זרים תכניע חרב בצל עב זמיר עריצים יענה

Translation: “like the heat in the dry land you will subdue the uproar of the strangers, *like* the heat in the shadow of the clouds the song of tyrants will be bent down.”

LXX: ὡς ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι διψῶντες ἐν Σιων ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἀσεβῶν οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας

NETS: “like faint-hearted persons thirsting in Sion, because of the impious, to whom you delivered us.”

LXX.D: “(Sie sind) wie kleinmütige Menschen, (wie wir,) die wir Durst leiden in Sion durch gottlose Menschen, denen du uns ausgeliefert hast.”

With respect to ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι, different explanations have been advanced. One suggestion is that the translator read כּוֹרֵם (25:4) as כּאֲדָם and קִיר (25:4) as קֶצֶר “shortness” (cf. Exo 6:9: מִקְצֵר רוּחַ “impatience” or “despondency”).<sup>47</sup> Another scholar argued the translator read קִיר כּוֹרֵם (25:4) as קֶר כּאֲדָם, a phrase he translated as “Menschen der Kälte,” which, in turn, would match the concept behind ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι “faint-hearted men.”<sup>48</sup> Yet another proposal is that ἄνθρωποι is an addition as in verse 4 and that ὀλιγόψυχοι was the result of reading זֶר in כּוֹרֵם as צֶר or קֶצֶר.<sup>49</sup> Another scholar viewed ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι as a free translation of קִיר כּוֹרֵם (25:4) as “persons treated violently by evil persons [are] like rushing water against a wall.”<sup>50</sup> Be that as it may, part 2 §6.1, below, will address the question as to how the phrase ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι fits in its literary context. Afterward, a tentative explanation as to how the translator arrived at ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι will be given.

The word διψῶντες seems to be related to כּחרב (cf. 25:4, where חרב was rendered with דיפָּאוּ). The phrase ἐν Σιων translates בצִּיּוֹן. One scholar

47. BDB, 894; HALOT, 3:1127.

48. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 41.

49. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 82, 83.

50. Arie van der Kooij, “Rejoice, O Thirsty Desert! (Isaiah 35): On Zion in the Septuagint of Isaiah,” in *Enlarge the Site of Your Tent: The City as Unifying Theme in Isaiah; The Isaiah Workshop—De Jesaja Werkplaats* (ed. Archibald L. H. M. van Wieringen and Annemarieke van der Woude; Ots 58; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 19.

explained ἐν Σιων here and in Isa 32:2 as the result of a lexical confusion because those are the only two places in the Tanach where ציון “desert” occurs.<sup>51</sup> The expression ἀνθρώπων ἀσεβῶν reflects the Hebrew זרים (cf. discussion under 25:2, above). Παραδίδωμι is one of the translator’s favorite stop-gap words.<sup>52</sup> Ziegler had noted that it is uncertain to which verb in the translator’s *Vorlage* παρέδωκας is linked. But he suggested that the translator could have read מנה or אנה in his *Vorlage*.<sup>53</sup> Although it is possible that the phrase οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας should be taken as a plus,<sup>54</sup> it may also be that the idea behind it is linked to תכניע in the translator’s *Vorlage*.<sup>55</sup> An important question to be discussed in part 2 §6.1, below, is the translator’s decision to introduce οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας here. The word שאון and the phrase ענה יענה were not translated.

25:6

MT: ועשה יהוה צבאות לכל-העמים בהר הזה משתה שמנים משתה  
שמרים שמנים ממחים שמרים מזקקים

Translation: “And Yahweh of hosts will give a banquet of oil on this mountain for all the peoples; a banquet of dregs of wine, oil flavored with marrow, refined dregs.”

LXX: καὶ ποιήσει κύριος σαβαωθ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο  
πίονται εὐφροσύνην πίονται οἶνον <sup>7</sup>χρίσονται μύρον

NETS: “On this mountain the Lord Sabaoth will make a feast for all nations: they will drink joy; they will drink wine; <sup>7</sup>they will anoint themselves with perfume.”

51. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 190. Differently from Troxel, cf. Jean Koenig, *L'herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe* (VTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1982), 147–48. See, however, the equivalence διψάω/ציה “waterless region” in Isa 35:1.

52. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 1:50; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 14.

53. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 117.

54. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 112. The question, which Ziegler raised (*Untersuchungen*, 117), of a possible influence of Ps 27:12; 41:3 on LXX Isa 25:5 will be discussed in part 2 §6.1, below.

55. Van der Kooij, “Rejoice, O Thirsty Desert!,” 19.

LXX.D: “Und der Herr Sabaoth wird allen Völkerschaften auf diesem Berg (etwas) zubereiten. *Sie werden Freude trinken, sie werden Wein trinken, <sup>7</sup>sie werden sich mit Duftöl salben.*”

The clause *καὶ ποιήσει κύριος σαβαωθ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο* translates *וְעָשָׂה יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת לְכָל־הָעַמִּים בְּהַר הַזֶּה*. The transliteration of *צְבָאוֹת* with *σαβαωθ* is a peculiarity of LXX Isaiah. This transliteration occurs fifty-two times in the LXX, out of which forty-seven are found in LXX Isaiah;<sup>56</sup> *παντοκράτωρ* “almighty” is the usual rendition of *צְבָאוֹת* in the rest of the LXX. The use of *ἔθνεσιν* for *עַמִּים* is important because the equivalence *ἔθνος/עַם* occurs only twenty-one times in LXX Isaiah, compared to ninety-one occurrences of the more usual *λαός/עַם* in the same book (cf. 25:8, below). As such, the translator’s choice of *ἔθνος* raises the question concerning his use of this word here (see part 2, §6.2 below).

The clause *πίονται εὐφροσύνην* stands in place of *מִשְׁתֵּה שְׂמִינִים*. In this clause, *πίονται* is clearly related to *מִשְׁתֵּה* as *πίνω* renders *שָׁתָה* five times in the LXX, three of which are in LXX Isaiah (Isa 5:12; 25:6 [2x]; Dan 1:5, 8). As for *εὐφροσύνη*, a scholar included it among passages that exemplify some sort of “clarification, solution of images, paraphrases.”<sup>57</sup> Another opined that *εὐφροσύνη* may “be *שְׂמִינִים* [in the translator’s *Vorlage*?] for one of the similar words *מִמְחִים שְׂמִינִים*.”<sup>58</sup> But it is better to explain *εὐφροσύνη* as due to the context.<sup>59</sup>

*Πίονται οἶνον* relates to *מִשְׁתֵּה שְׂמִינִים*. For the link between *πίονται* and *מִשְׁתֵּה*, see previous paragraph. In the LXX, *τρυγίας* “lees of wine, dregs” (cf. Ps 75:9) and *δόξα* “glory” (cf. Jer 48:11) both translate *שְׂמִינִים*. Isaiah 25:6 is the only place where *οἶνος* translates *שְׂמִינִים* “dregs of wine” in the LXX.<sup>60</sup>

*Χρίσονται μύρον* stands in place of *שְׂמִינִים מִמְחִים*. The noun *μύρον* “ointment, perfume” connects to *שְׂמִינִים* as there is some evidence for the equivalence *שֶׁמֶן/μύρον* in the LXX (Ps 133:2; Song of Sol. 1:3; Amos 6:6 [Prov 27:9 and Isa 39:9 are uncertain]) and should be seen as a case of free translation in LXX Isa 25:7.<sup>61</sup> Liebmann saw a possible connection between *χρίω* and *שְׂמִינִים*.<sup>62</sup> Ottley opined that the translator extracted “what he took for *יִמְשְׁחוּ*”

56. The others are 1 Sam 1:3, 11; 15:2; 17:45; Jer 46:10.

57. Scholz, *Jesaias*, 35.

58. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:226.

59. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 129n224.

60. Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 2010), 84. For a discussion of the etymology of *שְׂמִינִים*, cf. *HALOT*, 4:1584–1585.

61. Muraoka, *Two-Way Index*, 80.

62. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 268.

מר [‘they will anoint the Lord’] from מִשְׁתָּה שְׁמֵרִים.<sup>63</sup> But Ottley’s opinion must be rejected as it requires too many changes in relation to the *Vorlage*. Ziegler suggested that the translator had LXX Amos 6:6 in mind: οἱ πίνοντες τὸν διυλισμένον οἶνον καὶ τὰ πρῶτα μύρα χρίόμενοι “who drink thoroughly filtered wine and anoint themselves with the finest oils” (*NETS*).<sup>64</sup> Although LXX Isa 25:6 shares a high number of lexemes with LXX Amos 6:6 (πίνω, οἶνος, χρίω, μύρον), the phrase χρίω + μύρον occurs elsewhere (cf. Jdt 10:3 in the dative case).<sup>65</sup> It is better to see χρίσονται as a plus motivated by μύρον, which in itself may suggest the idea of “anointing.” Otherwise, χρίω has no connection with the Hebrew. The last clause שְׁמֵרִים מְזַקְקִים was not translated at all.<sup>66</sup>

25:7

MT: ובלע בהר הזה פניה־לוט הלוט על־כל־העמים והמסכה הנסוכה  
על־כל־הגוים

Translation: “And he will swallow<sup>67</sup> on this mountain the surface of the shroud that covers all the peoples and the covering that weaves over all peoples.”

LXX: ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ παράδος ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἢ γὰρ βουλή αὕτη ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη

*NETS*: “Deliver these things to the nations on this mountain, for this counsel is against all the nations.”

LXX.D: “Auf diesem Berg übergib dies alles den Völkerschaften! Denn dies ist der Ratschluss über alle Völkerschaften.”

The phrase ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ renders בהר הזה. Concerning παράδος, the scholarly opinion is divided. One scholar proposed that the translator’s *Vorlage* per-

63. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:226.

64. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 117.

65. Cf. Philo, *Spec.* 3:37: καὶ εὐάδεσι μύροις λίπα χρίόμενοι and Josephus, *Ant.* 19:239: χρισάμενος μύροις τὴν κεφαλὴν.

66. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 266; van der Vorm-Croughs, “The Old Greek of Isaiah,” 190–91.

67. Contrary to MT’s act. בִּלַּע, Targ. ויסתלעמון and Pesh. سٛطٛط have pass. verbal forms. HUB rightly claims that the pass. forms are due to a “different way of expressing verb-goal relationships (active-passive changes).”

haps read הָטִיל because the latter is translated with παραδίδωμι in Jer 22:26 (Alexandrinus).<sup>68</sup> Another claimed that the translator read פָּנִי in light of Aramaic פָּנָא “to release, turn to.”<sup>69</sup> However, it is highly unlikely that παράδος is connected to either הָלוּט or פָּנִי. As will be seen later, παράδος was introduced here for contextual reasons. The demonstrative ταῦτα relates to עַל (cf. Isa 30:12). Πάντα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν translates כָּל-הָעַמִּים. It is important to note that ἔθνος has already been used to translate עַמִּים in 25:6 and will render גּוֹיִם at the end of this verse. עַל-כָּל-הָלוּט/וּבָלַע were not translated.

Ἡ βουλὴ is connected to וְהַמְסַכָּה הַנְּסוּכָה. In LXX Isaiah, χωνευτός “molten” (Isa 42:17) and perhaps συνθήκη “mutual agreement” (Isa 30:1) render מְסַכָּה. The latter was not rendered in Isa 28:20. It has been suggested that the translator had some difficulty with the meaning of מְסַכָּה and resorted to the context in his use of βουλὴ.<sup>70</sup> But βουλὴ could also be an interpretation of the phrase וְהַמְסַכָּה הַנְּסוּכָה. As the latter denotes something that is covered, the translator interpreted it as something that is hidden. He then interpreted “what is hidden” as a reference to a βουλὴ. The phrase πάντα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν represents עַל-כָּל-הָעַמִּים.

25:8

MT: בָּלַע הַמּוֹת לְנֶצַח וּמַחָה אֶדְנִי יְהוָה דְּמָעָה מֵעַל כָּל-פָּנִים וְחָרַפְתָּ עִמּוֹ:  
יִסִּיר מֵעַל כָּל-הָאָרֶץ כִּי יְהוָה דִּבֶּר

Translation: “He swallowed up death forever. Yahweh God will wipe away tears from over all faces and the reproach of his people he will make depart from over all the earth because Yahweh spoke.”

LXX: κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύσας καὶ πάλιν ἀφεῖλεν ὁ θεὸς πᾶν δάκρυον ἀπὸ παντὸς προσώπου τὸ ὄνειδος τοῦ λαοῦ ἀφεῖλεν ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησεν

NETS: “Death, having prevailed, swallowed them up, and God has again taken away every tear from every face; the disgrace of the people he has taken away from all the earth, for the mouth of the Lord has spoken.”

68. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 269.

69. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 41.

70. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 266.

LXX.D: “Der Tod, *mächtig geworden*, hat sie verschlungen, und *wiederum nahm Gott jede Träne von jedem Antlitz weg*; die Schmach des Volkes nahm er weg von der ganzen Erde, denn *der Mund* des Herrn hat gesprochen.”

The phrase κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύσας renders בלע המות לנצח, where κατέπιεν corresponds to בלע (cf. Isa 9:15; 28:4; 49:19), taken as a past tense verb, ὁ θάνατος corresponds to המות, read as the subject of the verb בלע, and ἰσχύσας is linked to לנצח. Different from the usual interpretation of the Hebrew, LXX has “death” as the subject of the clause.<sup>71</sup> As for לנצח, Ottley argued that the meaning of נצח as “to be ‘lustre,’ ‘brightness,’” accounts for its translation in LXX Isa 25:8 as “victory,” “glory.”<sup>72</sup> In LXX Isaiah, αἰών “time” (Isa 13:20; 28:28; 33:20) and χρόνος (Isa 13:20; 33:20; 34) translate לנצח. Although Isa 25:8 is the only place in the LXX where ἰσχύω renders נצח, 1 Chr 15:21; Jer 15:18 attest respectively to similar translations with ἐνισχύω and κατισχύω, both meaning “to strengthen.”<sup>73</sup> Despite the examples from 1 Chr 15:21; Jer 15:18, Rahlfs saw the translator’s use of ἰσχύσας for לנצח as a case of a free translation.<sup>74</sup> However, it is highly plausible that the translator read נצח via Aramaic נצח “to win, triumph.”<sup>75</sup>

Clause 8b καὶ πάλιν ἀφείλεν ὁ θεὸς πᾶν δάκρυον ἀπὸ παντὸς προσώπου stands in place of כּל־פּנים מַעַל דְּמַעָה יְהוָה אֲדָנִי וּמַחָה אֲדָנִי. Πάλιν is a plus in the LXX as it is also elsewhere in LXX Isaiah (Isa 7:4; 23:17).<sup>76</sup> As for ἀφείλεν, LXX Isa 25:8 is the only place where ἀφαιρέω “to remove” renders מַחָה.<sup>77</sup> This does not mean the translator had some difficulty with מַחָה. His translation of the latter with ἐξάλειψω “to obliterate” (Isa 43:25) and ἀπαλείψω “wipe off” (Isa 44:22) shows that he was well acquainted with the meaning of that verb. His choice of ἀφαιρέω must be explained in analogy with the second ἀφαιρέω in verse 8c. Πᾶν is a plus in the LXX.

The last clause of verse 8, τὸ ὄνειδος τοῦ λαοῦ ἀφείλεν ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησεν, stands for עֲמוּ יִסִּיר מֵעַל כּל־הָאָרֶץ. For the

71. Thomas Hieke, “‘Er verschlingt den Tod für immer’ (Jes 25,8a): Eine unerfüllte Verheißung im Alten und Neuen Testament,” *BZ* 50 (2006), 37.

72. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:227.

73. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 38; Alfred Rahlfs, “Über Theodotion-Lesarten im Neuen Testament und Aquila-Lesarten bei Justin,” *ZNW* 20 (1921), 184n1.

74. Rahlfs, “Theodotion-Lesarten,” 183–84.

75. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 41.

76. Arie van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision* (VTSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 72.

77. Muraoka, *Two-Way Index*, 20.

pair *ὄνειδος*/חַרְפָּה, see Isa 25:8; 30:5; 54:4. The pronominal suffix in עָמוֹ is not attested in the LXX. The use of ἀφαιρέω as a rendition of סֹרֵר is common but the use of the past tense ἀφείλεν for the prefixed verb יִסֹּר is not—prefix verbs are usually rendered with future tense verbal forms in LXX Isaiah. Finally, τὸ στόμα is a plus in the LXX, probably due to the stereotyped nature of the Greek phrase τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησεν in LXX Isaiah (1:20; 24:3; 25:8; 58:14).

25:9

MT: וְאָמַר בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא הִנֵּה אֱלֹהֵינוּ זֶה קִוִּינוּ לוֹ וְיִשְׁעֵנוּ זֶה יְהוָה קִוִּינוּ לוֹ  
נִגִּילָה וְנִשְׂמַחָה בִּישׁוּעָתָה

Translation: “And it will be said<sup>78</sup> on that day: ‘here is our God in whom we waited and he saved us; this is Yahweh, we waited for him; let us be glad and rejoice in his salvation.’”

LXX: καὶ ἐροῦσιν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἰδοὺ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐφ’ ᾧ ἠλπίζομεν καὶ ἡγαλλιώμεθα καὶ εὐφρανθησόμεθα ἐπὶ τῇ σωτηρίᾳ ἡμῶν

NETS: “And they will say on that day, Lo, our God, in whom we were hoping, and we were glad in our salvation.”

LXX.D: “Und *sie werden* an jenem Tag sagen: ‘Siehe, unser Gott — auf ihn hofften wir, und wir jubelten über *unsere* Rettung.’”

In clause 9a, the phrase καὶ ἐροῦσιν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ corresponds to וְאָמַר הִנֵּה, except that LXX has “they will say” instead of MT’s “he will say.” Clauses 9b–c present no major differences between LXX and MT. The expression ἐφ’ ᾧ renders לוֹ in 9c. זֶה as an archaic relative pronoun is reflected in the relative pronoun ᾧ.<sup>79</sup> Although the equivalence ἐλπίζω for קוֹה occurs only here and in LXX Isa 26:8, other semantically similar lexemes appear: ὑπομένω “to wait for” (Isa 40:31; 51:5; 59:9; 60:9), ἀναμένω “to anticipate eagerly the coming of” (Isa 59:11), μένω “to wait for” (Isa 5:2, 4, 7), and πείθω “to rely on” (Isa 8:17; 33:2). Clauses 9d–e are not rendered in the LXX either because of a mistake due to the use of the similar phrase לוֹ קִוִּינוּ זֶה in 9c and 9e or was consciously

78. Whereas 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> and Targ. וְיִימַר align with MT, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> וְאָמַרַת and Pesh. וְאָמַר attest to second masc. sing. verbs. וְאָמַר in MT should be taken as an imper. subj. For a discussion of imper. subj., cf. Joüon §155b.

79. Joüon §145c.

not translated as clauses 9c and 9e in MT are synonymic phrases.<sup>80</sup> Finally, the phrase “his salvation” in MT 9g becomes “our salvation” in LXX 9e. The verbal form ἡγαλλιώμεθα renders ונשמחה here. Ziegler noted that ἀγαλλιάω “to rejoice” is a favorite verb for LXX Isaiah, appearing very rarely in the LXX, except for the Psalms.<sup>81</sup>

25:10

MT: כי תנוח יד יהוה בהר הזה ונדוש מואב תחתיו כהדוש מתבן במי  
[במו] מדמנה

Translation: “Because the hand of Yahweh will rest on this mountain, but Moab will be trampled under him like the straw heap is trampled in the waters of Madmenah.”

LXX: ὅτι ἀνάπαυσιν δώσει ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο καὶ καταπατηθήσεται ἡ Μωαβῖτις ὃν τρόπον πατοῦσιν ἄλωνα ἐν ἀμάξαις

NETS: “because God will give rest on this mountain, and Moabitis shall be trodden down as they tread a threshing floor with wagons.”

LXX.D: “Denn Gott wird Erholung *schenken* auf diesem Berg, und die Moabitis wird in der Weise niedergetreten werden, wie man *eine Tenne mit Wagen* tritt.”

The expression ἀνάπαυσιν δώσει is an attempt at translating תנוח “it will rest.” Ziegler rightly noted that ἀνάπαυσις usually renders נוח in LXX Isaiah, except for κατάπαυσις in LXX Isa 66:1.<sup>82</sup> Charles T. Fritsch suggested that the translator may have read הניח and that he dropped the feminine יד as the latter would not agree with the former masculine verbal form.<sup>83</sup> Fritsch’s suggestion is unlikely. First, הניח is never rendered with δίδωμι + ἀνάπαυσις in LXX Isaiah, with the exception of LXX Isa 25:10 (cf. Isa 14:1, 3; 28:2, 12; 30:32; 46:7;

80. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 276, argued that the translator’s *Vorlage* lacked the phrase יהוה זה ויושיענו קוינו לו ויושיענו זה יהוה. See, however, καὶ σώσει ἡμᾶς οὗτος κύριος ὑπεμείναμεν αὐτῷ in σ’ and θ’.

81. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 42.

82. Ibid.

83. Charles T. Fritsch, “The Concept of God in the Greek Translation of Isaiah,” in *Biblical Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman* (ed. Jacob M. Myers, Otto Reimherr, and Howard N. Bream; New York: Augustin, 1960), 159.



63:14; 65:15). Second, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> is in line with MT. As will be seen below, the phrase “give rest” makes good sense in the context of LXX Isa 24–27. Further, it should be noted that θεός does not usually render יהוה in LXX Isaiah.

The expression καταπατηθήσεται “it will be trodden down” translates ונדוש תחתיו “it will be trampled under him.”<sup>84</sup> As for the equivalence Μωαβίτις/מואב, it should be noted that מואב is translated with both Μωαβ (11:14; 15:9; 16:2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14) and Μωαβίτις in LXX Isaiah (15:1[3x]; 2, 4, 5, 8; 16:7; 25:10).<sup>85</sup> With the exception of Jer 25:21; 31:33, the pair Μωαβίτις/מואב is unique to LXX Isaiah. For further discussion on Μωαβίτις, see part 2 §6.2, below.

The expression ὃν τρόπον translates the comparative כ in כהדוש כ. Πατοῦσιν is a translation of the passive הדוש “it is trodden” as “they tread.” As for the translation of מדמנה במי מתבן במי with ἄλωνα ἐν ἀμάξαις, Ziegler rightly pointed out that the translator used ἀμάξαις “chariots” because in the time of the translator “chariots” were used to thresh (cf. Isa 41:15).<sup>86</sup> Thus, the suggestion that the translator read מדמנה במי as במרכבה “with chariots”<sup>87</sup> must be rejected.<sup>88</sup>

25:11

MT: ופרש ידיו בקרבו כאשר יפרש השחה לשחות והשפיל גאותו עם  
ארבות ידיו

Translation: “And he will stretch his hand in its midst as the swimmer stretches to swim and he will bring his pride down despite the movement of his hands.”

LXX: καὶ ἀνήσει τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ὃν τρόπον καὶ αὐτὸς ἐταπείνωσεν τοῦ ἀπολέσαι καὶ ταπεινώσει τὴν ὕβριν αὐτοῦ ἐφ’ ἃ τὰς χεῖρας ἐπέβαλεν

NETS: “And he will send forth his hands, as he himself brought him low to destroy him, and he will bring low his pride—things on which he laid his hands.”

84. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 44, 278.

85. Emanuel Tov, “Personal Names in the Septuagint of Isaiah,” in *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. Michaël N. van der Meer et al.; VTSup 138; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 426–27.

86. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 97.

87. LEH, 31.

88. HUB.

LXX.D: “und er wird seinen Händen *freien Lauf lassen*, ebenso wie *auch er (Moab) (andere) erniedrigt hat bis zur Vernichtung*; und er wird seine (Moabs) Überheblichkeit erniedrigen (, nämlich die Unternehmungen vereiteln), *an die es Hand angelegt hat.*”

The expression בקרבו “in his midst” was not translated in the LXX. With respect to ἀνῆσει “he will loosen,” it should be noted that the verb ἀνῆμι “unfasten, untie” is not a rendition of פָּרַשׁ; the latter is never rendered by the former in Isaiah. An expression similar to the one in Isa 25:11 is found in Isa 65:2: פָּרַשְׁתִּי יָדַי “I have stretched out my hands,” where it is literally rendered with ἐξέπτεσα τὰς χεῖράς μου “I stretched out my hands.” The example from Isa 65:2 is important as it points to the translator’s knowledge of the expression פָּרַשׁ יָד “to stretch the hand.” As such, his use of ἀνῆμι in LXX Isa 25:11 is important and will be discussed in the next section. The phrase καὶ αὐτός is a plus in the LXX.<sup>89</sup> The Greek expression ἐταπείνωσεν τοῦ ἀπολέσαι is the result of reading השחית לשחות “the swimmer to swim” as השחית לשחת “he brought low to destroy.”<sup>90</sup> The phrase ἐφ’ αὐ does not seem to correspond to the Hebrew text well. Whereas MT reads “his hands,” LXX has simply “the hands.” The verbal form “he threw” is a plus in the LXX, whereas the word אַרְבוֹת was apparently not translated.

25:12

MT: מִבְצָר מִשְׁגָּב חֹמַתֶּיךָ הַשָּׁחַ הַשְּׁפִיל הַגִּיעַ לָאָרֶץ עַד-עָפָר

Translation: “But he will bring down the high fortification of your walls; he will make it low; it will touch the ground, the very dust.”

LXX: καὶ τὸ ὕψος τῆς καταφυγῆς τοῦ τοίχου σου ταπεινώσει καὶ καταβήσεται ἕως τοῦ ἐδάφους

89. Liebmann (“Der Text,” 281, 282) conjectured that the translator’s *Vorlage* read והוא. His conjecture is unlikely as והוא is not attested in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> or 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>.

90. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 281; Ottley, 2:227. Fischer (*In welcher Schrift*, 41) proposed that the translator read פָּרַשׁ הַשָּׁחַת לְשָׁחַת כְּאֲשֶׁר נִפְשׁוּ שָׁחַת לְשָׁחַת by which he read י as ך, ך as ך, and ה as ח. However, following Fischer, reading the ך from פָּרַשׁ as ן would result in פִּוּשׁ, in which, in turn, the translator would have to change the position of the last two consonants so as to create נִפְשׁוּ. Although confusion between certain Hebrew consonants is possible, it is unlikely the translator made so many changes in a single word.

NETS: “And he will bring low the height of the refuge of your wall, and it will come down all the way to the ground.”

LXX.D: “und die Höhe der Zuflucht, deiner Mauer, wird er erniedrigen, *und sie wird* herabsinken bis zum Boden.”

LXX has the singular “your wall,” whereas the plural “your walls” is in MT. The verb “to bring low” in the LXX is a translation of its counterpart in Hebrew. The reading “he humbled” is not translated in the LXX. Ziegler thought it was not present in the translator’s *Vorlage*.<sup>91</sup> The conjunction “and” is a plus in the LXX. Although *καταβαίνω* “to go down” is not a very literal translation of *נגע*, it seems to communicate well the idea of the Hebrew. The phrase *לְאֶרֶץ* is not translated in the LXX. Interesting is the translator’s utilization of *τείχος* for *חומה* because this equivalence appears only here in the LXX. Usually, *τείχος* renders *חומה* (e.g., Isa 2:15; 22:10, 11). Contrast with *τείχος* in Isa 24:23; 26:1.

---

91. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 54, 53, 56; on p. 56, he argued that the author of the Hebrew *Vorlage* was responsible for adding the synonym *השפיל*.



## ISAIAH 26:1–6: A COMPARISON

26:1

MT: ביום ההוא יושר השיר־הזה בארץ יהודה עיר עז־לנו ישועה ישית  
חומות וחל

Translation: “In that day this song will be sung in the land of Judah: we have a fortified city, he will set walls and rampart as salvation.”

LXX: τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ᾗσσονται τὸ ᾠσμα τοῦτο ἐπὶ γῆς Ιουδα λέγοντες  
ἰδοὺ πόλις ὀχυρά καὶ σωτήριον ἡμῶν θήσει τεῖχος καὶ περίτειχος

NETS: “On that day they will sing this song on the land of Ioudas, saying: Look, a strong city, and he will make our salvation its wall and outer wall.”

LXX.D: “An jenem Tag *werden sie* dieses Lied im Lande Juda singen: ‘*Siehe*, eine befestigte Stadt, *und* als unser Heil wird er Mauer und Ringmauer aufrichten.”

The phrase τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ᾗσσονται τὸ ᾠσμα τοῦτο ἐπὶ γῆς Ιουδα translates ביום ההוא יושר השיר־הזה בארץ יהודה. The only small difference is the active plural ᾗσσονται for the passive singular יושר.<sup>1</sup> The plural form ᾗσσονται is based on the immediate context (cf. לנו). The same is true for the addition

1. Whereas 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> attests to the act. sing. יושר, 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> is in line with MT’s יושר. As 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> preserved only the two last consonants שר, it is possible that it too was in line with the pass. reading in MT. Among the other witnesses, א’ ἀσθήσεται, Pesh. ܝܫܪܝܬܐ (reconstructed), and Vulg. *cantabitur* support MT. Contrarily, Targ. יושבחון and Pesh. ܝܫܪܝܬܐ (Ms. 7a1) have verbs in the act. voice. See discussion in Arie van der Kooij, “The Text of Isaiah and Its Early Witnesses in Hebrew,” in *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker*

of λέγοντες. The latter was introduced to make the transition to direct speech more explicit.<sup>2</sup>

The phrase ἰδοὺ πόλεις ὀχυρά καὶ σωτήριον ἡμῶν stands for עיר עז-לנו ישועה. The interjection ἰδοὺ has no counterpart in MT. Liebmann argued that the translator's *Vorlage* read עיר עז הנה.<sup>3</sup> Van der Kooij, however, opined that the plus ἰδοὺ is not due to a different *Vorlage*.<sup>4</sup> Besides, no other manuscript tradition attests to הנה. As will be seen later, ἰδοὺ is the result of harmonization with Isa 33:20 (see part 2 §7.1, below). In LXX, עז is mostly translated with ἰσχύς "strength" and ἰσχυρός "strong" (Isa 49:5; 51:9; 52:1; 62:8; 43:16). The translator's pick of ὀχυρός "firm, lasting" for עז is interesting because that equivalence occurs only here in LXX Isaiah, while being rare elsewhere.<sup>5</sup> The reason for the translator's use of ὀχυρός will be discussed later. As for the plus καί, Liebmann thought the translator's *Vorlage* read וישועה.<sup>6</sup> However, once again, it must be noted that no other textual witness attests to the conjunction "and." It is more appropriate to view καί as reflecting the translator's perception that a new phrase started with לנו. This is more likely as the translator joined the personal pronoun "our" with "salvation" (cf. σωτήριον ἡμῶν), while in MT לנו is best taken with what precedes it.<sup>7</sup>

Θήσει τεῖχος καὶ περίτειχος לחל חומות וחל. While the equivalence τίθημι/שית is common elsewhere in the LXX, Isa 26:1 is the only place

---

*Offered by the Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (ed. Yohanan Goldman, Arie van der Kooij, and Richard D. Weiss; VTSup 110; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 144.

2. Richard R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint* (Codex Alexandrinus) (London: Clay and Sons, 1904–1906), 2:228, who rightly viewed λέγοντες as a "natural addition." Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA 12/3; Münster: Aschendorffsche, 1934), 58, entertained the possibility that in the case of LXX Isa 26:1 a form of לאמר could have already been introduced in the translator's *Vorlage*. However, all other ancient witnesses lack an attestation to לאמר. For a discussion of the addition of a form of λέγω to introduce direct speech in LXX Isaiah, see Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses* (SCS 61; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 58–59.

3. Ernst Liebmann, "Der Text zu Jesaja 24–27," ZAW 22 (1902): 52.

4. Arie van der Kooij, "The Cities of Isaiah 24–27 according to the Vulgate, Targum and the Septuagint," in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27: The Isaiah Workshop–De Jesaja Werkplaats* (ed. Hendrik Jan Bosman et al.; OtSt 43; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 194; idem, "Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah," 65.

5. Prov 10:15; 18:11, 19. Note also κράτος and ἰσχυρός in α' and σ' respectively.

6. Liebmann, "Der Text," 52.

7. Van der Kooij, "The Cities of Isaiah 24–27," 194; idem, "Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions," in *As Those Who Are Taught: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL* (ed. Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull; SBLSymS 27; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 65; LXX.D.

where it occurs in LXX Isaiah. The verb שִׁית appears five other times in LXX Isaiah, being variously translated (Isa 5:6 [ἀνίημι];<sup>8</sup> 15:9 [ἐπάγω]; 16:3 [not translated]; 22:7 [2x: ἐμφράσσω]<sup>9</sup>). A contextual study of the passages just cited will show that the translator's understanding of the immediate context guided his lexical choices. The same applies to τίθημι in Isa 26:1 which, as will be seen, fits well within its context. The singular τεῖχος translates the plural חומות. Whereas 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> וחיליה וחומותיה, and Targ. שוראה attest to a plural reading, Pesh. ܠܝܬܐ<sup>10</sup> and Vulg. *murus* preserve readings in the singular. Although certainty is impossible in this matter, it is more likely that LXX Isaiah's *Vorlage* contained a plural reading in the light of the evidence in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>/4QIsa<sup>c</sup>. If this is correct, then is also likely that the translator used the singular τεῖχος because of the following singular חל. Finally, Isa 26:1 is the only place where περίτειχος translates חל[י].<sup>11</sup> The translator's pick of περίτειχος betrays a concern for stylistics.

26:2

MT: פתחו שערים ויבא גוי צדיק שמר אמנים

Translation: "Open the gates, and let a righteous people enter, [a people] keeping faithfulness."

LXX: ἀνοίξατε πύλας εἰσελθάτω λαὸς φυλάσσω δικαιοσύνην καὶ φυλάσσω ἀλήθειαν

NETS: "Open the gates; let a people enter that keeps righteousness and that keeps truth,"

8. For a discussion of LXX Isa 5:1–7, including helpful comments on ἀνίημι, cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 179–80.

9. For a brief discussion of the sole occurrence of ἐμφράσσω in LXX Isaiah, cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 116.

10. Although there is no spelling difference between sing. and pl. in masc. nouns in the emph. state in Syr., ܠܝܬܐ is most likely sing. because it lacks a *seyame*, a common feature in MS 7al marking pl. nouns.

11. Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 2010), 201. Pesh. reads ܠܝܬܐ ܕܠܝܬܐ and Vulg. *murus et antemurale*. Michael Sokoloff, *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009), defined ܠܝܬܐ ܕ as a "small wall built up in front of a larger one." Targ.'s translation with פורקן יתסם על שוראה ורחמין "salvation will be set on its walls and mercies" is highly interpretive.

LXX.D: “Öffnet die Tore, es soll einziehen das Volk, *das* Gerechtigkeit *wahrt und* das Wahrheit wahr.”

The Greek ἔθνος renders גוי in the majority of the cases in the LXX. Contrarily, the equivalence λαός/גוי occurs only twelve times in the LXX, five of which are in LXX Isaiah (Isa 9:2; 26:2; 55:5; 58:2; 60:5).<sup>12</sup> As such, it will be important to discuss later the translator’s reason for using λαός here. Φυλάσσω is a double rendition of שמר. In LXX Isaiah, δίκαιος often translates the adjective צדיק (Isa 3:10; 5:23; 29:21; 45:21; 53:11; 57:1[2x]; 60:21), whereas the noun צדק is usually rendered with δικαιοσύνη (e.g., Isa 1:21; 26:9). Contrarily, the use of δικαιοσύνη for צדיק occurs only six times in the LXX (Ps 72:7; Prov 2:20; 11:21, 30; 20:7; Isa 26:2). As all the ancient witnesses attest to an adjective, it is very likely that the translator’s *Vorlage* contained צדיק instead of צדק.<sup>13</sup> It seems that the translator decided to use the noun δικαιοσύνη as a parallelism with the noun ἀλήθεια. The same applies to his double use of φυλάσσω.<sup>14</sup> It has been suggested that the expression φυλάσσω δικαιοσύνη for גוי צדיק was probably due to the rarity of the Hebrew construction.<sup>15</sup> However, similar expressions occur elsewhere (cf. גוי קדוש in Exod 19:6, quoted in 4Q504, V:10;<sup>16</sup> and ועמך כלם צדיקים in Isa 60:21). The translator was more concerned with stylistics (cf. φυλάσσω + noun occurring three times in 26:2–3). The plus *καί* is further evidence that the translator realized שמר אמנים גוי צדיק as two separate but parallel phrases: φυλάσσω δικαιοσύνη and φυλάσσω ἀλήθειαν. Finally, the noun ἀλήθεια normally paraphrases אמת in LXX Isaiah (Isa 10:20; 16:5; 38:3; 42:3; 48:1; 59:14, 15); Isa 26:2 is the only occasion where ἀλήθεια stands for אמון in LXX Isaiah (cf. Ps 12:2; 31:24). Its use in 26:2 is contextual in nature, see ἀλήθεια in 26:3.

26:3

MT: יצר סמוך תצר שלום שלום כי בך בטוח

Translation: “A steadfast creature<sup>17</sup> you will preserve peacefully because it trusts in you.”

12. The other occurrences are: Josh 3:17; 4:1; Jer 9:8; 33:9; Ezek 20:41; 28:25; Zech 14:14. See also ἔθνος in α’.

13. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 53: “LXX wird kaum etwas Anderes als צדיק gelesen haben.” See also 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>/4QIsa<sup>c</sup> צדיק, Targ. זכאה, Pesh. ܙܚܐ, and Vulg. *iusta*.

14. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:228; HUB.

15. HUB.

16. In citations of Qumran documents, I follow the DSSR edition.

17. For the translation “steadfast creature,” cf. discussion in Takamitsu Muraoka, “The Community Rule (1QS): Column 4” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and*



LXX: ἀντιλαμβανόμενος ἀληθείας καὶ φυλάσσω εἰρήνην ὅτι ἐπὶ σοί

NETS: “that lays hold of truth and that keeps peace, because in you”

LXX.D: “*das sich an Wahrheit hält und Frieden wahrt.*” Denn auf dich”

The phrase ἀντιλαμβανόμενος ἀληθείας seems to stand in place of the difficult יצר סמוך. Ottley and Fischer argued that the translator saw the root נצר in יצר (cf. תצר).<sup>18</sup> Contrarily, Liebmann linked ἀντιλαμβανόμενος with סמוך.<sup>19</sup> His proposal is plausible because ἀντιλαμβάνομαι renders סמך in Isa 63:5 (cf. Ps 3:6; 119:116). As for ἀληθείας, Liebmann suggested it translates יצר “inclination, striving,”<sup>20</sup> arguing that the ideas of “Gebilde,” “Gedanke” in יצר equal “correct disposition” in “prägnanten Sinne.”<sup>21</sup> Differently, Fischer viewed ἀλήθεια as an *ad sensum* translation of סמוך, namely, what is “established, supported” denotes what is “true.”<sup>22</sup> Instead of the proposals above, it seems more probable that the expression ἀντιλαμβανόμενος ἀληθείας is the result of an interpretation of יצר סמוך. Although this phrase appears only here in the *Tanach*, its occurrence in Qumran documents (e.g., 1QS 4:5; 8:3) makes it likely that the translator of Isaiah was well acquainted with its meaning. For the translator, יצר סמוך “steadfast creature” meant “to take hold of the truth” (ἀντιλαμβανόμενος ἀληθείας). It parallels the translator’s interpretation of גוי תצר שמים/שומר אדמה/שומר ארץ as φυλάσσω δικαιοσύνην/φυλάσσω ἀλήθειαν/καὶ φυλάσσω εἰρήνην respectively (26:2–3).<sup>23</sup>

The phrase καὶ φυλάσσω εἰρήνην translates תצר שלום. Liebmann saw שמר behind φυλάσσω.<sup>24</sup> However, as φυλάσσω renders נצר in Isa 60:21 (cf. 2

*Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 339–40.

18. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:228; Johann Fischer, *In Welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?* (BZAW 56; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930), 41.

19. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 54. In LXX Isaiah, ἀντιλαμβάνομαι translates חזק (Isa 41:9; 51:18; 64:6), תמך (Isa 42:1), סמך (Isa 26:3[?]; 63:5), סעד (Isa 9:6), גאל (Isa 49:26), and פגע (Isa 59:16).

20. For this definition, cf. *HALOT* 2:429.

21. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 54.

22. Fischer, *In Welcher Schrift*, 41.

23. The Pesh. translator also interpreted the phrase יצר סמוך as to “keep the truth” כִּי יִצְרֵהּ אֱלֹהִים. Perhaps the Greek translation influenced the Syriac translator. Even if this was the case, he must have thought the LXX interpretation was reasonable enough to be used for his translation. Among other versions, Targ. interpreted it as “with a perfect heart” בְּלִבָּב שְׁלִים, whereas the Vulg. read it as “the old wandering went away” *vetus error abiit*.

24. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 54.

Kgs 17:9; 18:8; Prov 2:8; 4:13; 13:3, 6; 28:7), it seems better to see φυλάσσω translating תצַר in 26:3. The only difference is the translator's use of a participle for an imperfect verb in MT. The phrase εἰρήνην ὅτι ἐπὶ σοὶ renders שְׁלוֹם כִּי בְךָ. The double use of שְׁלוֹם is attested in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>/1QIsa<sup>b</sup>, while 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> is too fragmentary.<sup>25</sup> Liebmann thought the translator's *Vorlage* contained only one שְׁלוֹם and read as follows: סְמוּךְ יִצְרוּ שְׁמוֹר שְׁלוֹם כִּי בְךָ בְטוֹחַ.<sup>26</sup> Contrarily, Ziegler opined that the translator himself dropped one שְׁלוֹם.<sup>27</sup> Because the double use of שְׁלוֹם is well attested in the Isaiah scrolls and other ancient versions, it seems that the translator dropped one שְׁלוֹם for the sake of condensation, as he often does.<sup>28</sup>

Finally, the phrase ὅτι ἐπὶ σοὶ stands in place of כִּי בְךָ בְטוֹחַ. The word בְטוֹחַ is a minus in LXX Isa 26:3. Whereas 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> lacks בְטוֹחַ, the latter is attested in 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> and fragmentarily in 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>, where the last two consonants וּח were preserved. Among the ancient witnesses, εβρ' βατοου, α' πεποιθασι, Targ. אֶתְרַחֲצוּ, and Vulg. *speravimus* attest to בְטוֹחַ.<sup>29</sup> It is unclear whether the Pesh.'s *Vorlage* contained two forms of בְטַח at the end and beginning of verses 3–4 or whether the translator condensed them into שָׁכַן.<sup>30</sup> The same applies to 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. The lack of בְטוֹחַ in the latter raises the question as to whether the translator's *Vorlage* also lacked this term, but given the translator's tendency to condensate, it seems that he dropped one of the בְטַח words.

26:4

MT: בִּטְחוּ בַיהוָה עַד־עֵד כִּי בִיהַ יְהוָה צוּר עוֹלָמִים

Translation: "Trust in Yahweh forever because the Lord, Yahweh, is an everlasting rock."

LXX: ἤλπισαν κύριε ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας ὁ αἰώνιος

25. While Targ. שלמא and Vulg. *pacem* have also preserved שְׁלוֹם doubly, Pesh. attests to only one occurrence of it with other minor departures: "you will keep peace for us" אֲנִי שָׁלַמְתִּי לָכֵן.

26. Liebmann, "Der Text," 56.

27. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 53.

28. See van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 196, and the discussion of "condensation" therein.

29. For a discussion of the Vulg.'s use of first pers. *speravimus* and second pers. pl. *sperastis* verbs, cf. Arie van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 310–11, who calls attention to the immediate context of Isa 26:1–8 to explain the Vulg.'s translation.

30. It is also interesting to note that Pesh. and Vulg. used first pers. pl. verbs in their rendition of 26:3: *speravimus* and שָׁכַן both meaning "we hoped, trusted."

NETS: “have they hoped, O Lord, forever — the great, everlasting God.”

LXX.D: “*haben sie gehofft, Herr, bis auf ewige Zeiten, du großer, ewiger Gott.*”

On the use of ἡλπισαν, Ottley pointed out that “the LXX here show their fondness for ἐλπίζ.”<sup>31</sup> However, although the use of ἐλπίζω for בָּטַח occurs often elsewhere in the LXX,<sup>32</sup> in LXX Isaiah it translates בָּטַח only here and in 30:12. Contrarily, the equivalence πείθω/בָּטַח appears frequently in Isa (12:2; 31:1; 32:11, 17; 36:4, 5, 6[2x], 7, 9; 37:10; 42:17; 47:8; 50:10; 59:4). As such, the question must be asked as to why the translator decided to use ἐλπίζω here. A tentative answer will be provided later. Ἠλπισαν shows the translator read בָּטַחוּ as a past tense verb instead of an imperative as in MT. Finally, the vocative κύριε indicates ἡλπισαν must be read with the preceding ὅτι ἐπὶ σοί (26:3).

The phrase κύριε ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος translates בִּיהוָה עַד־עַד. The only difference is that the translator dropped the preposition ב to read יהוה as a vocative: κύριε. The phrase ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος for עַד־עַד in Isa 26:4 is found only in Ps 132:12. Otherwise, τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος is more common (e.g., Ps 83:18; 92:8), while εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος is also attested (Ps 132:14).<sup>33</sup>

The phrase ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας ὁ αἰῶνιος stands in place of כִּי בִיה יהוה צוֹר עוֹלָמִים. Against MT’s double reference to the Lord (בִּיה יהוה), LXX has only one mention. BHK and BHS propose to delete the word בִּיה in MT based on LXX’s single use of θεός. However, θεός renders יה in LXX Isa 38:11, albeit this is the only place, besides 26:4, where this translation occurs. It is also used for יהוה several times in Isaiah.<sup>34</sup> Besides—with the exception of 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> (only one יהוה) and perhaps the highly interpretive Targ. במימֶר דְּחִילָה יִי—1QIsa<sup>a</sup> בִּיה יהוה, 4QIsa<sup>b</sup> אֲדִנִּי בִּיה, א’ ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ κύριος, ο εβρ’ βαια αδωναι, Syr. ܐܕܝܢܝܐ ܒܝܗܐ, and Vulg. in Domino Deo all attest to יהוה יה.<sup>35</sup> It is, thus, highly likely

31. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:228.

32. Ps 4:6; 9:11; 13:6; 21:8; 22:5, 6; 26:1; 27:3; 28:7; 31:7, 15; 32:10; 33:21; 37:3, 5; 40:4; 41:10; 44:7; 52:10; 55:24; 56:4, 5, 12; 62:9, 11; 78:22; 84:13; 86:2; 91:2; 115:9, 10, 11; 118:9; 119:42; 143:8; Judg 9:26; 20:36; 2 Kgs 18:5, 24; 1 Chr 5:20; Job 24:23; Jer 13:25; Hos 10:13; Mic 7:5.

33. In LXX Isa 65:18, עַד־עַד is a minus.

34. Isa 4:2; 6:12; 7:17; 8:17, 18; 9:10; 10:20, 23, 26; 11:2, 3; 14:2, 3, 5, 27; 23:17; 24:21; 25:8, 10; 26:4; 27:1; 30:9, 18, 30; 31:1; 33:5; 36:15, 18, 20; 37:20, 22; 38:20; 39:6; 40:27, 28, 31; 41:4, 14; 42:5, 12, 19, 24; 43:11, 14; 44:5, 6, 23; 45:11, 21; 49:13; 51:13; 54:13; 55:6; 58:8, 9, 11, 13; 61:9; 65:23.

35. Arie van der Kooij, “Isaiah 24–27: Text-Critical Notes,” in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27*:

that the translator's *Vorlage* contained ביה יהוה. If this was the case, the translator used ὁ θεός as a one-word translation for the two-word phrase יה יהוה. See also κύριος for יה יהוה in Isa 12:2.

The phrase ὁ μέγας ὁ αἰώνιος stands for צור עולמים. Μέγας occurs only here as a translation of צור. Ottley argued that the LXX translators were not fond of the rock as a metaphor for God and that they usually omitted or paraphrased it.<sup>36</sup> However, there may be more to the translator's use of the expression ὁ θεός ὁ μέγας (cf. part 2 §7.2, below). In LXX Isaiah, the expression ὁ θεός ὁ μέγας occurs only here. A similar phrase appears in LXX Isa 33:22: ὁ γὰρ θεός μου μέγας/יהוה אדיר. Outside Isaiah, the phrase in question appears a few times either as a translation of האל הגדל (Deut 10:17; Jer 39:18, 19; Dan 9:4) or of the Aramaic אלה רב (Dan 2:45; see also Dan 4:37).

26:5

MT: כי השח ישביו מרום קריה נשגבה ישפילנה ישפילה עד-ארץ יגיענה  
עד-עפר

Translation: "Because he shattered the inhabitants of the high, the high city would be brought low, he would bring it low to the ground, he would make it touch the dust."

LXX: ὃς ταπεινώσας κατήγαγες τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν ὑψηλοῖς πόλεις  
ὄχυρὰς καταβαλεῖς καὶ κατὰξεις ἕως ἐδάφους

NETS: "you who have humbled and brought down those who dwell in lofty places; you will cast down strong cities and bring them down to the ground."

LXX.D: "Der du diejenigen erniedrigt und hinabgestoßen hast, die auf Höhen wohnen; befestigte Städte wirst du niederwerfen und bis zum Boden einebnen"

---

*The Isaiah Workshop—De Jesaja Werkplaats* (ed. Hendrik Jan Bosman et al.; OtSt 43; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 14. Van der Kooij further pointed to inscription B. of H. Bet Layy near Lakish for an extrabiblical attestation of יה יהוה.

36. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:228. See also Charles T. Fritsch, "The Concept of God in the Greek Translation of Isaiah," in *Biblical Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman* (ed. Jacob M. Myers, Otto Reimherr, and Howard N. Bream; New York: Augustin, 1960), 163. For paraphrases of צור, cf. Isa 17:10; 30:29; 44:8; Ps 18:2; 31:3; 41:2; 62:2, 6; Hab 1:12; Deut 31:9; 32:2, 5, 15, 18, 30, 31, 37.

The phrase *ὅς ταπεινώσας κατήγαγες τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν ὑψηλοῖς* stands in place of *כִּי הִשָּׁח יֹשְׁבֵי מְרוֹם*. Although the relative pronoun *ὅς* occupies the place of the particle *כִּי*, it cannot be seen as a rendition of the latter. As such, it will be important to discuss later why the translator decided to introduce *ὅς* here.

It is not easy to pinpoint exactly how the translation relates to its *Vorlage* in this verse. *Ταπεινώσας/κατήγαγες* seem to be a double rendition of *הִשָּׁח* because of their position in front of *יֹשְׁבֵי מְרוֹם*.<sup>37</sup> While *ταπεινώ* renders *הִשָּׁח* in Isa 2:11, 17; 5:15; 25:12, *κατάγω* never does so. Be that as it may, it is still important to note the translator's use of the participle *ταπεινώσας* and second person *κατήγαγες* for MT's third person *הִשָּׁח*. The second person verbs in the Greek show the translator interpreted verse 5 as a continuation of the direct speech in verse 4.<sup>38</sup> The use of *ἐνοικέω* for *יֹשֵׁב* is interesting because the equivalence *ἐνοικέω/יֹשֵׁב* occurs less often in the LXX than *κατοικέω/יֹשֵׁב*. Whereas the former occurs only twenty-three times in the LXX, out of which sixteen are found in LXX Isaiah (e.g., Isa 24:1, 6, 17; 26:9, 18, 21), the latter occurs twenty-two times in LXX Isaiah alone (e.g., Isa 24:5, 6). As such, it will be important to discuss why the translator chose *ἐνοικέω* in the present context.

The phrase *ἐν ὑψηλοῖς* renders *מְרוֹם* (for *ὑψηλοῖς* = *מְרוֹם*, cf. 24:4 and comments there). The preposition *ἐν* was added because the translator took *מְרוֹם* as a designation of place (i.e., adverb of place) (cf. *יֹשְׁבֵי אֶרֶץ* = *οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ* in 24:6). The meaning the translator was trying to convey was “the ones who dwell in the high places” and, as such, he was led to use the preposition *ἐν* followed by *ὑψηλοῖς* as a masculine/neuter adjective.

The sentence *πόλεις ὀχυράς καταβαλεῖς* stands for *קריה נשגבה ישפילנה*. Whereas MT reads in the singular *קריה נשגבה*, LXX Isaiah has the plural *πόλεις ὀχυράς* (cf. also plural “cities” in 24:12;<sup>39</sup> 25:2: *קריה/πόλεις בצורה ὀχυράς*). The translator's pick of *πόλεις* for *קריה* is interesting when compared to *πολίχνη* “fort, small town” in *a*. The same is true concerning his choice of *ὀχυρός* for *נשגבה*. In LXX Isaiah, *ὑψόω* usually renders *שָׁגב* (Isa 2:11, 17; 12:4 [*נשגב/ὑψώθη*]), whereas *ὀχυρός/שָׁגב* occurs only in 26:5; 30:13 (*πόλεως ὀχυρᾶς/נשגבה*). It will thus be important to discuss why the translator picked *ὀχυρός* here. Finally, aside from here, *καταβάλλω* never stands for *שָׁפַל*. The latter is usually translated in LXX Isaiah with *ταπεινώ* (2:9, 12; 5:15; 10:33; 13:11; 25:11; 29:4; 40:4; 57:9). *Καταβάλλω* seems to be the result of free rendering in the light of the context with some concern for stylistics: *κατήγαγες/*

37. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 58.

38. Ibid., 57.

39. Ibid., 58.

καταβαλεῖς/κατάξεις.<sup>40</sup> Finally, note the use of second person καταβαλεῖς for third person ישפילנה.

The Hebrew עֲד־אֲרָץ is a minus in the LXX just as לֹאֲרָץ is a minus in 25:12.<sup>41</sup> The translator found עֲד־אֲרָץ redundant in the face of the similar עֲד־עָפָר immediately following (cf., e.g., his translation of 24:4).<sup>42</sup> Contrarily, the conjunction “and” in καὶ κατάξεις ἕως ἐδάφους is a plus in the LXX and κατάξεις ἕως ἐδάφους renders יגיענה עֲד־עָפָר. While there is no example for the equivalence ἐδάφους/אֲרָץ in the LXX, עָפָר is translated with ἔδαφος in LXX Isa 25:12; 29:4. As such, the phrase עֲד־אֲרָץ has no formal equivalent in the Greek and should be seen as a minus.<sup>43</sup> The choice of ἔδαφος catches the eye because in LXX Isaiah עָפָר is also rendered with χοῦς (Isa 49:23; 52:2). These examples suggest the translator had a choice between ἔδαφος and χοῦς. Why did he decide to use ἔδαφος? The answer will be entertained later, but for now compare Isa 25:12: עָפָר לֹאֲרָץ יגיענה/καταβήσεται ἕως τοῦ ἐδάφους.<sup>44</sup>

The translator omitted the pronominal suffixes attached to נגוע/שפל<sup>45</sup> because their use is unnecessary in Greek. It is possible to say in Hebrew “the fortified city, he will bring *it* low;” but a literal rendering would be awkward in Greek. As the phrase “fortified city” functions as the direct object of the verb κατάγω, the pronominal suffixes become unnecessary.

26:6

MT: תרמסנה רגל רגלי עני פעמי דלים

Translation: “Feet will trample it, the feet of the poor, the soles of the feet of the powerless.”

LXX: καὶ πατήσουσιν αὐτὰς πόδες πραέων καὶ ταπεινῶν

40. Cf. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:229, who also points to LXX Isa 63:3, 6.

41. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 58. Among the ancient witnesses, while Targ. ימאכניה/ירמינה and Vulg. *humiliabit/humiliabit* are aligned with MT, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> ישפילנה and Pesh. ܡܫܟܝܢ ܠܝܪܥܐ ܡܢ ܡܢܬܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܢܬܠܐ attest to only one שפל. Given LXX Isaiah’s bent to condensation, it seems more likely that the translator himself dropped ישפילנה. Otherwise, his *Vorlage* may have contained only one שפל.

42. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 51. For a discussion of LXX Isaiah’s tendency to drop parallel or synonymous clauses, including a reference to Isa 26:5, cf. van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 192. While she viewed יגיענה עֲד־עָפָר as a minus, I prefer to see ישפילנה עֲד־אֲרָץ as the dropped clause in the LXX.

43. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 58.

44. Cf. also θ’ ἕως χώματος.

45. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 58.

NETS: “and the feet of the gentle and humble will trample them.”

LXX.D: “und es werden auf sie treten Füße von Sanftmütigen und Niedrigen.”

While the conjunction *καί* is a plus in the LXX, the verb *πατήσουσιν* renders *תרמסנה* (cf. Isa 1:12). Elsewhere in LXX Isaiah, the cognate *καταπατέω* is the most common translation of *רמס* (cf. Isa 16:4; 28:3 [ברגלים תרמסנה/τοῖς ποσὶν καταπατηθήσεται]; 41:25). The pronoun *αὐτάς* renders the pronominal suffix attached to *תרמסנה*. The plural *πόδες* translates the dual *רגלי*, whereas the singular *רגל* is a minus in the LXX, perhaps due to dittography.<sup>46</sup> The plural *πραέων* stands for the singular *עני* only here in LXX Isaiah (cf. Job 24:4; Zeph 3:12; Zech 9:9). Liebmann argued that the translator took *עני* in a collective sense because the plural *πραέων* could also have been influenced by the plural *דלים*.<sup>47</sup> *Καί* is once again a plus in the LXX and *ταπεινῶν* renders *דלים* as it does in 11:4; 25:4 (cf. Zeph 3:12). The Hebrew *פעמי* is a minus in the LXX and certainly the result of a deliberate omission by the translator for condensation purposes.<sup>48</sup>

Both LXX and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> attest to the plural *πραέων/עניים* and both preserve only *רגלי*,<sup>49</sup> which raises the question whether the translator's *Vorlage* contained the plural *עניים* and only *רגלי*. Liebmann thought that *רגל* was not in the LXX *Vorlage*.<sup>50</sup> It is impossible to know whether the LXX *Vorlage* contained *רגל* or not, however it seems more likely that the LXX translator dropped *רגל* in view of his translation style, which tends to drop synonyms or parallel clauses (cf. 26:3–5).<sup>51</sup>

46. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 53, 54.

47. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 59.

48. HUB; van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 198.

49. Pesh. is in line with 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX, whereas Targ. and Vulg. are aligned with MT.

50. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 59; also Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 54.

51. HUB.





## PART 2: LXX ISAIAH IN ITS OWN RIGHT

Part 2 takes LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 in its own right. It attempts to assess whether the Greek text has a coherence of its own as far as its contents are concerned. It pays considerable attention to the translator's lexical choices, use of particles or conjunctions, and similar themes. Additionally, it tries to see whether agreements and disagreements with MT (cf. part 1, above) come together to form a coherent unit. Part 2 is divided into three main chapters: Isaiah 24 (chapter 5), Isaiah 25 (chapter 6), and Isaiah 26:1–6 (chapter 7). Each chapter offers the author's own critical translation and a commentary of each subsection of the chapters above. With a few exceptions, a verse-by-verse commentary is offered almost throughout. Closing each chapter is a summary. This summary discusses the main theme(s) identified in each chapter, notes the way in which the translator's lexical choices lend coherence to the Greek text, and addresses how "literal" and "free" translations cohere with each other.



5  
LXX ISAIAH 24 IN ITS OWN RIGHT

5.1. ISAIAH 24:1–3: TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

- 1a: Look, the Lord is devastating the world  
1b: and he will lay it waste  
1c: and he will expose<sup>1</sup> its surface  
1d: and he will disperse those who dwell in it.  
2a: And the people will be like the priest  
    and the servant like the master  
    and the female servant like the mistress  
2b: and the buyer will be like the seller  
    and the lender like the borrower  
    and the creditor like the one to whom he owes  
3a: the earth will be completely ruined  
3b: and it will be completely plundered,<sup>2</sup>  
3c: for the mouth of the Lord spoke these things.

24:1

Isaiah 24:1–3 forms the first subunit of LXX Isa 24–27. The use of future indicative verbs links these verses together, notwithstanding the appearance of different participants in verses 1–3. In verse 1, the Lord appears as the first participant, whereas several designations of social classes function as the par-

---

1. GELS, 40; LXX.D. NETS reads “uncover.”

2. LXX.D: “Die Erde wird ganz vergehen, und die Erde wird gänzlich geplündert werden.” F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock (*A Grammar of Septuagint Greek* [Boston: Ginn, 1905], §61) termed the noun in the construction dat. + cognate verb in the inf. as “cognate dative” and illustrated it with several examples from Plato and elsewhere in the LXX. The construction under discussion above seems to fall under the same category despite being composed of a dat. + a cognate finite verb.

ticipants in verse 2. Verse 3 also introduces the “earth” as a new participant. The meaning, however, is clear. The Lord’s destruction of the world in verse 1 will lead to a complete social change in verse 2 as well as to a complete destruction of the γῆ in verse 3. That these three verses go together is also clear from the phrase “for the mouth of the Lord spoke these things” in verse 3c, whose function is clearly to set verses 1–3 off from what follows.<sup>3</sup>

Clause 1a: ἰδοὺ κύριος καταφθείρει τὴν οἰκουμένην. As discussed in part 1 ch. 2, above, the translator’s use of καταφθείρω/οἰκουμένη for ארץ/בקר is striking. For both of these Hebrew lexemes, the translator could have used παράσσω (cf. Isa 19:3) and γῆ (e.g., 24:3, 4, 5, 6). The translator’s employment of καταφθείρω/οἰκουμένη suggests an interpretation of Isa 24:1 on “a higher level.” First, οἰκουμένη occurs also in Isa 24:4. Although the equivalence οἰκουμένη/תבל appears often, it does not follow that οἰκουμένη has to be the translation of תבל, as discussed in part 1 ch. 2, above. The translator’s use of οἰκουμένη in 24:1, 4 suggests that he already had an interpretive plan in mind that involved the employment of οἰκουμένη in both passages. And, second, the only other place where καταφθείρω/οἰκουμένη appears is LXX Isa 13:5: לחבל כל-הארץ/τοῦ καταφθεῖραι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην. As in Isa 24:1, Isa 13:5 introduces the Lord devastating the whole world. Whereas the link between Isa 13:5; 24:1 is not immediately apparent in MT’s use of different verbal roots (בקר/חבל), the employment of καταφθείρω/οἰκουμένη in both places makes their link clear. The translator’s linkage of Isa 13:5; 24:1 suggests a move that preceded his translation work. That this was the case will become clearer as the commentary on LXX Isa 24:1 proceeds.

The meaning of οἰκουμένη requires some attention. Seeligmann argued that the term οἰκουμένη appears “either in a context in which God’s punishment is prophesied to all peoples, or where the central figure of an (Assyrian) world ruler loudly puts forward his claim to world sovereignty.”<sup>4</sup> In wording that differs considerably from MT, LXX Isa 10:13–14, for instance, casts the ruler of the Assyrians as a claimer to world sovereignty: καὶ σείσω πόλεις κατοικουμένας καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην καταλήμψομαι/ואוריד כאביר יושבים ותמצא כקן ידי לחיל העמים.<sup>5</sup> This example and others led Seeligmann to con-

3. Contra J. C. M. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías (Cap. 24 de Isaías)* (Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973), 63, who took Isa 24:1–6 as the first unit of ch. 24.

4. Isac Leo Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (MVEOL 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948), 81. Outside LXX Isaiah, Seeligmann pointed to Ps 71:8 (MT 72:8); 1 Esd 2:2 (paraphrase of 2 Chr 36:23; Ezra 1:2); Esth 3:13b where οἰκουμένη denotes a claim to world power.

5. Ibid. Seeligmann quoted the Hebrew text behind LXX Isa 10:14 as: ותמצא כקן ידי לחיל העמים

clude that *οἰκουμένη* in LXX Isaiah denoted “the historical background of the smaller and larger Hellenistic states.”<sup>6</sup>

Das Neves took the term *οἰκουμένη* in LXX Isaiah in a much narrower sense than Seeligmann. For him, *οἰκουμένη* referred not to the “historical background of the smaller and larger Hellenistic states” but to Israel. He found support for his view on his analysis of LXX Isa 13, a chapter that das Neves took as a parallel to LXX Isa 24. His main points were: First, he interpreted the imperatival phrase *ἀνοίξατε οἱ ἄρχοντες* “open, o rulers” (LXX Isa 13:2) as addressed against Israel’s leaders based on his view that imperatival phrases elsewhere were also directed against the leaders of Israel (cf. LXX Isa 28:29; 41:25).<sup>7</sup> Second, das Neves saw in *ἄρχοντες* “rulers” (LXX Isa 13:2) a reference to Israel’s leaders based on the use of the same term in Isa 1:23; 3:4; 28:4, which in his opinion also denoted Israel’s leaders.<sup>8</sup> Das Neves held this position despite recognizing that *ἄρχοντες* was also used to refer to pagan princes (LXX Isa 1:10, 11, 12; 19:11, 13; 23:8; 49:7) and future ideal rulers (Isa 9:6(5); 32:1; 43:4; 60:17).<sup>9</sup> Third, he argued that concepts such as *ἄνομος/ὑβρις* (Isa 13:11) refer to Israel rather than to non-Israelites. For him, *ἄνομος* always refers to Israel in LXX Isaiah because *ἄνομος* denotes the breaking of the *νόμος* “law,” a law that belongs to Israel.<sup>10</sup> And, fourth, das Neves viewed the concept of the “remnant” (cf. *καταλελειμμένοι* in Isa 13:12) as limited to Israel only.<sup>11</sup> Based on these points, das Neves concluded that *οἰκουμένη* in Isa 13 does not have a universal scope but that it refers to the boundaries of Israel only.<sup>12</sup> And given the fact that he saw LXX Isa 13; 24 as parallels, das Neves argued that *οἰκουμένη* in LXX Isa 24:1 also denoted Israel’s geographical boundaries. He strengthened his arguments with two other points. First, he took *οἰκουμένη* and *γῆ* “land” as synonyms (LXX Isa 24:4), defining the former in the light of the latter. And, second, he further pointed out that the *ἐνοικοῦντας* “the ones inhabiting” appears in both 24:1, 17. Because LXX Isa 24:17 mentions

---

*לכל ממלכות האליל* but only the beginning *בין ידי ותמצא* belongs to Isa 10:14; the remaining *ממלכות האליל* comes from Isa 10:10. *לכל* should be read as *לחיל* (see Isa 10:14).

6. Ibid. Whether Seeligmann’s view that *οἰκουμένη* denotes the “smaller and larger Hellenistic states” or not falls outside the scope of the present enquiry as it would necessitate venturing into the translation’s historical background.

7. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 74–75, 71, 73.

8. Ibid., 88, 75.

9. Ibid., 75.

10. Ibid., 89, 90, 94.

11. Ibid., 92, 93.

12. Ibid., 94.

only  $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$  in connection with  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\tilde{\nu}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$  and because he took  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta/\gamma\tilde{\eta}$  as synonyms, das Neves concluded that  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta/\gamma\tilde{\eta}$  points to the land of Israel.<sup>13</sup>

Das Neves's argument that  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$  refers to Israel suffers a few methodological pitfalls. First, his treatment of only a few aspects in LXX Isa 13 was too general, but at the same time he read too much into it. For instance, his claim that  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  has to refer to Israel's leaders is a good example of reading too much into one single term. As seen above, he recognized that  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  in LXX Isaiah does not necessarily denote an Israelite leader. The same is true for his claim that  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\zeta\alpha\tau\epsilon$   $\omicron\iota$   $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  (LXX Isa 13:2) refers to Israel's leaders because imperatival clauses in LXX Isaiah usually refer to Israel. However, it is less than clear that imperatival phrases are reserved for Israel alone in LXX Isaiah.

The term  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$  should clearly be taken as “world” in LXX Isa 24:1, 4. Against das Neves, it must be noted that whereas  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$  can lend a broad scope to  $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$  “earth,” the reverse is not true. Moreover, the link between the destruction of the  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$  with the destruction of “cities,” “strong cities,” and the “city of the ungodly” (Isa 24:10, 12; 25:2; 26:5) indicates that  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$  has a much broader range than the “land of Israel.” The more so as the “city of the ungodly” (Isa 25:2) is to be identified with the important city of “Babylon” (cf. comments to Isa 25:2, below).

Clause 1b:  $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\gamma$ . The verb  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\mu\acute{\omega}$  and cognates appear also in 24:10 (MT שבר), 12 (MT שמה) describing the desolate state of “cities” for MT’s “city” (עיר/קריה). The use of  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\mu\acute{\omega}$  in LXX Isa 24:1, 10, 12 is important as it links the desolation of the  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$  with the desolation of “cities.” This link is not as clear in MT’s use of three different Hebrew terms:  $\text{שמה/תהו/בלק}$ . The link between the destruction of the “world” with the destruction of “cities” is not strange in LXX Isaiah—nor is the idea that  $\acute{\omicron}$   $\kappa\upsilon\tilde{\rho}\iota\omicron\varsigma$  is behind it. Isa 13:9 proclaims that the “day of the Lord” will come to “turn the whole world desolate” ( $\theta\epsilon\iota\tilde{\nu}\alpha\iota$   $\tau\eta\gamma$   $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\gamma$   $\acute{\omicron}\lambda\eta\gamma$   $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\mu\omicron\gamma$ ), while the appearance of  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma$  in Isa 14:23 makes it clear that the destruction of the “whole world” relates to the destruction of Babylon: “I will turn Babylon into a desert” ( $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$   $\tau\eta\gamma$   $\text{Βαβυλωνίαν}$   $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\mu\omicron\gamma$ /MT  $\text{קפד למורש}$  “I will turn her into a place for owls”). Nowhere else is the connection between the “whole world’s” destruction with the destruction of an important city/country clearer than in Isa 37:18: “the kings of the Assyrians have made the whole world and their country desolate” ( $\acute{\eta}\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\omega\sigma\alpha\gamma$   $\text{βασιλείς Ἀσσυρίων}$   $\tau\eta\gamma$   $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\gamma$   $\acute{\omicron}\lambda\eta\gamma$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\tau\eta\gamma$   $\chi\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\gamma$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\gamma$ ). The translator’s use of  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\mu\acute{\omega}$  in connection with  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$  is another clue that he interpreted Isa 24:1 in the light

13. Ibid., 95.

of 13:5, 9, 11; 14:23. It seems that the destruction of the οἰκουμένη in 24:1 was connected with the destruction of Babylon in Isa 13–14. If this is correct, then it will be another indication of an interpretation on a “higher level” that preceded his translation.

Clauses 1c–d: καὶ ἀνακαλύψει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς καὶ διασπερεῖ τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν αὐτῇ. The expression ἀνακαλύπτω + πρόσωπον as its direct object appears only here and in Tob 2:9, where it refers to the removing of a cover from a face.<sup>14</sup> In part 1 ch. 2, above, it was noted that the use of ἀνακαλύπτω to translate הִפָּתַח is striking. If the translator’s *Vorlage* read הִפָּתַח, the question arises as to why he decided to employ ἀνακαλύπτω. Although his use of ἀνακαλύπτω could at first seem like a mistake, it is important to pursue the question as to whether ἀνακαλύπτω makes sense in its literary context. A look at LXX Isa 24:1 in “its own right” reveals that ἀνακαλύπτω fits in well. The general sense of LXX Isa 24:1c–d is that the Lord will uncover the face of the οἰκουμένη by dispersing its inhabitants.<sup>15</sup> Because LXX makes good sense, it seems more likely that the translator’s utilization of ἀνακαλύπτω was not the result of a mistake but of a particular interpretation of the Hebrew. Moreover, the translator could not really have used ἀδικέω to translate הִפָּתַח in Isa 24:1, as he did in Isa 21:3, because that would imply that the Lord was the author of a morally wrong action against the οἰκουμένη. In its literary context, ἀνακαλύπτω coheres well with both “its [world] face”<sup>16</sup> and “he will disperse its inhabitants.”

Part 1 ch. 2, above, has discussed the striking use of ἐνοικέω to translate כָּשַׁח. In the rest of LXX Isa 24 the translator employed κατοικέω for כָּשַׁח (24:5–6a) and ἐνοικέω (24:6b, 17). Das Neves took ἐνοικέω/κατοικέω in LXX Isa 24 as synonyms, seeing in those terms a reference to Jews in the translator’s time.<sup>17</sup> However, as will be argued below, the terms ἐνοικέω/κατοικέω carry different nuances in LXX Isa 24.

## 24:2

The function of verse 2 is to emphasize that the devastation of the world will affect people of a higher social status. Contrarily to MT, the translator neatly divided verse 2 into two main parts by using the verb ἔσται twice. The first part focuses on social hierarchy, whereas the second on financial status. In the first part, the people, the servant, and the maid who occupy a lower position in society are mentioned before the priest, the master, and the mistress, who

14. GELS, 40. See also 2 Cor 3:18 and part 1, above.

15. The phrase διασπείρω + ἐνοικοῦντας appears only here in the whole of the LXX.

16. Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaja 24–27,” ZAW 23 (1903): 212.

17. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 95, 121, 254.

were higher in the social hierarchy of the translator's day. As noted in part 1 ch. 2, LXX lacks the pronominal suffixes attached to "lord" and "mistress" in MT. If his *Vorlage* was in line with MT, the translator's dropping of those pronominal suffixes served the purpose of making the contrast between the social classes mentioned in 24:2 sharper.<sup>18</sup> Contrarily, the second part mentions first the buyer, the lender, and the creditor, who have a stronger financial status than the seller, the borrower, and the one who has debts. In light of Deuteronomy's instruction to Israel that it should only lend money but never borrow (Deut 15:6, 8, 10; 28:12), the statement that the lender and the borrower will occupy the same social status is striking. The devastation of the world will affect people from every social class.

### 24:3

The use of *φθείρω* indicates that 24:3 forms an *inclusio* with 24:1. Its middle (24:2) highlights the effects of the destruction of the *οἰκουμένη* on its inhabitants regardless of their social status. LXX Isa 24:3 also clarifies the type of "destruction" that will assail the *οἰκουμένη*. The verb *φθείρω*, which occurs only three times in Isaiah (24:3, 4; 54:16), either means "to damage physically" or "to corrupt morally."<sup>19</sup> In Isa 24:3a, *φθείρω* is best interpreted as "to damage physically" because it parallels *προνομεύω*. This verb entails taking something as spoils of war.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, the immediate context of LXX Isa 24:3 clearly points to the physical devastation of the *οἰκουμένη*/*γῆ*. It refers to a "curse" that will consume the *γῆ* (Isa 24:6). It also mentions the mourning of the "wine" and "vine" (Isa 24:7), which entails their drying up due to a "curse" on the *γῆ*. In turn, the dried vine was not able to produce good wine and beer (Isa 24:9). As such, it becomes clear that the "ruining" of the *οἰκουμένη*/*γῆ* in Isa 24:1–3 relates to the plundering of the earth of its natural resources. Although *φθείρω* will appear again in Isa 24:4, that verse starts a new section (see below).

As discussed in chapter 2, above, LXX has the second *γῆ* as a plus against MT. If the translator's *Vorlage* aligned with MT, an explanation for the translator's insertion of *γῆ* is needed. First, the translator inserted *γῆ* to make the two clauses in LXX Isa 24:3a–b parallel with the two clauses in LXX Isa 24:19<sup>21</sup>

18. Liebmann, "Der Text," 212. Liebmann was of the opinion that the translator's *Vorlage* lacked the pronominal suffixes under discussion. He reasoned that the translator would have betrayed his faithfulness in translating had he dropped those pronominal suffixes to emphasize the contrast between the social classes.

19. GELS, 714 and Exod 10:15; Gen 6:11 cited there.

20. GELS, 588. See also Isa 8:3; 10:13; 11:14; 13:16; 17:14; 44:22, 24.

21. Liebmann, "Der Text," 216.



(for the differences between MT and LXX of Isa 24:19, see ch. 2, above). Different from MT, Isa 24:3, 19 both have γῆ as the last term of their respective clauses. And, second, the insertion of γῆ in Isa 24:3b betrays a concern with the rhetorical figure known as epiphora. An “epiphora is the repetition of the final word or group of words in successive verses or cola. The repeated element is given special emphasis, both by way of repetition, and by its position at the end of the sentence.”<sup>22</sup> In Isa 24:3–6, with the exception of 24:5a, the word γῆ is often repeated at the end of certain clauses (cf. 24:3a–b, 4a, c, 6a, c). The plus γῆ in 24:3b made the “epiphora” figure possible.<sup>23</sup> Thus, the insertion of γῆ in 24:3 does not seem to point to an on-the-spot type of translation. Rather, it is most plausibly explainable as a well thought out decision that must have preceded the process of translation.

#### 5.2. ISAIAH 24:4–7: TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

- 4a: The earth grieved
- 4b: and the world was ruined
- 4c: and the high ones of the earth grieved;
- 5a: it is because the earth acted lawlessly by reason of its settlers,
- 5b: because they transgressed the law
- 5c: and changed the ordinances, an everlasting covenant.
- 6a: Therefore, a curse will consume the earth
- 6b: because its settlers sinned;
- 6c: therefore, those inhabiting the earth will be poor,
- 6d: and few men will be left.
- 7a: The wine shall mourn,
- 7b: the vine shall mourn
- 7c: all who rejoice in heart will groan.

#### 24:4

The lack of any conjunction and the change from future to past tense verbs set off Isa 24:4 from what precedes it. This unit extends to Isa 24:7. Isaiah 24:4–7 forms a well-knit unit. The conjunction δέ in Isa 24:5 links it with Isa 24:4. Likewise, the expression διὰ τοῦτο in 24:6 (2x) connects this verse with 24:5. Finally, the future tense verbs in Isa 24:7 link it with the equally future perspective of Isa 24:6.

22. Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses* (SCS 61; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 231.

23. Ibid., 231–32. For more examples from LXX Isaiah, see pp. 231–38.

The use of *πενθέω* in Isa 24:4a and Isa 24:4c forms an *inclusio*, setting Isa 24:4b apart. The focus of verse 4 is on the ruin of the *οἰκουμένη*, which provides the reason for the grieving of both the *γῆ* and its “high ones” (Isa 24:4a, c). In part 1 ch. 2, above, it was noted that nowhere else in the LXX does *φθείρω* “to damage” translate either *לְנַחֵם/לְנַחֵם*. A look at LXX Isa 24:4 in its literary context offers some clues as to why the translator employed *φθείρω* here. The image of the *οἰκουμένη/γῆ* being ruined has already appeared in Isa 24:1a, 3a, where the translator used the cognate *καταφθείρω* and *φθείρω* itself. By employing *φθείρω* in Isa 24:4b, the translator enhanced the coherence of his Greek translation while pointing to an interesting link between Isa 24:1a, 4b: whereas the former describes the Lord as “destroying” the world (*καταφθείρει τὴν οἰκουμένην*), the latter describes the world as already “destroyed” (*ἐφθάρη ἡ οἰκουμένη*). This type of move suggests a well thought-out consideration of the Hebrew on a “higher level” before the translation started. As was discussed under Isa 24:3 above, the parallel use of *φθείρω* with *προνομεύω* there suggested that a physical devastation of the *οἰκουμένη/γῆ* is envisaged in *φθείρω*. The use of *φθείρω* in Isa 24:4 suggests that it has another nuance because of its connection with 24:5. This issue will be addressed below.

Another important point to be discussed is the identity of the *ὑψηλοί* (Isa 24:4c). In his study of *ὑψηλοί* and cognates in LXX Isa 2:12; 3:16; 10:33; 26:5, das Neves identified the *ὑψηλοί* of 24:4 as the “arrogant Jews” of the translator’s time and, more narrowly, with his Jewish leaders. Das Neves’s view of the *ὑψηλοί* as “arrogant Jews” is related to his conviction that Isa 24 as a whole concerns the land of Israel and “ungodly Jews” in the translator’s time (cf. discussion on *οἰκουμένη* on 24:1, §5.1 in this work).<sup>24</sup> In the context of LXX Isa 24:1–4, the phrase *οἱ ὑψηλοί τῆς γῆς* denotes those who occupy a higher social status in society (Isa 24:2). In its larger literary context, the “high ones of the earth” parallels the “glorious ones of the earth” (Isa 26:15) who are expected to receive “evil” from the Lord. The theme of the Lord’s punishment of the *ὑψηλοί/ἐνδοξοί* appears also in Isa 10:33, while the punishment of the *ἐνδοξοί* can also be found in Isa 5:14; 23:8, 9. While the *ἐνδοξοί* of Isa 23:8, 9 refer to Tyre’s merchants,<sup>25</sup> the identity of the *ὑψηλοί/ἐνδοξοί* in Isa 5:14; 24:4; 26:15 is less clear, although they do denote a group of people that have control of the *οἰκουμένη* (Isa 24:1, 4). As elsewhere in LXX Isaiah (10:13–14; 14:16–17), where the “ruler of the Assyrians” and the “man” who is linked to Babylon claim authority over the *οἰκουμένη*, it stands to reason to conclude that the “high ones/glorious of the earth” are somehow linked with Assyria/Babylon—

24. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 130, 131.

25. van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 81.

the more so as the “high ones of the earth” (Isa 24:5) parallel the “ungodly” (Isa 24:8), who are associated with Babylon in Isa 25:2 (cf. comments on Isa 25:2, §6.1 in the present study).

#### 24:5

The particle *δέ* deserves further discussion. While Brenton, Ottley, and *NETS* translated it “and,” LXX.D has the lightly contrastive “*aber*.” In LXX Isaiah, the particle *δέ* can indicate succession “and, then” or contrast “but.”<sup>26</sup> As a contrast, *δέ* often appears together with a personal pronoun (cf., e.g., Isa 42:17),<sup>27</sup> a construction that does not apply to Isa 24:5a. Therefore, *δέ* in Isa 24:5 is best taken as having a successive function.

The translator’s use of *ἀνομέω* is also important. Das Neves has suggested that the translator, by using *ἀνομέω*, had the Israelites in view as opposed to pagans—especially as he translated the plural “laws” (תורות) with the singular “law” (τὸν νόμον).<sup>28</sup> Das Neves’s interpretation of *ἀνομέω* as addressed to Jews in the translator’s time was largely dependent on his view that οἰκουμένη/γῆ in LXX Isa 24 referred to the land of Israel.<sup>29</sup> The question as to whether *ἀνομέω* has Jews as opposed to pagans in view cannot be answered now, but will become clear later. For now, it must be noted that the use of *ἀνομέω* is not a straightforward translation of חנה (cf. part 1 ch. 2 in the present study). When analyzed as a text in its own right, it becomes clear that the translator’s choice of *ἀνομέω* in Isa 24:5 betrays a “higher level” interpretation of the Hebrew. Isaiah 24:5b says that the inhabitants of the γῆ broke “the law” (τὸν νόμον) as opposed to MT’s “laws;” Isa 24:16 proclaims judgment on “the rejecters of the law” (τὸν νόμον), where “law” does not appear in MT. Most striking is Isa 24:5a’s link with Isa 24:20 where the γῆ is portrayed as collapsing because ἀνομία “lawlessness” prevailed against her. It is clear that the translator wanted to emphasize the concept behind *ἀνομέω* and cognates in his translation of Isa 24.

26. Phillippe le Moigne, *Le livre d’Ésaïe dans la Septante: ecdotique, stylistique, linguistique ou Esquisse d’une poétique de la Septante* (PhD diss., Paris: École Pratique des Hautes Études, 2001), 307, 334.

27. Ibid., 334. For a thorough discussion of the particle *δέ* in LXX Isaiah including its “synonymic use,” cf. pp. 307–83.

28. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 130–31: “O tradutor tem em vista o povo de Israel, tanto mais que traduz תורות por νόμος, no sing.”

29. Ibid., 131.

Isaiah 24:5a, with its use of *διά* + the accusative *κατοικοῦντας*, lays the responsibility of the *γῆ*'s lawlessness on its inhabitants.<sup>30</sup> The lexeme *κατοικέω* deserves further discussion here. As remarked in part 1 ch. 2 in this study, it is important to debate whether *ἐνοικέω/κατοικέω* in LXX Isa 24:1, 5–6a, 6b, 17 are used as synonyms or whether they convey different nuances. While *ἐνοικέω/κατοικέω* can both mean “to dwell,” only *κατοικέω* can also mean “to settle in, colonize.”<sup>31</sup> More technically, *κατοικέω* may refer to noncitizens.<sup>32</sup> It appears that *κατοικέω* in Isa 24:5a, 6b carries a different nuance from *ἐνοικέω* in Isa 24:1, 6c, 17. More specifically, *κατοικέω* may refer to a group of people that came to “settle” the *γῆ*. In Isa 24:5a, 6b, that group is charged with “breaking the law” and “changing the ordinances—an eternal covenant” (for more on this, see comments below). The advantage of seeing *κατοικέω* with a slightly different nuance than *ἐνοικέω* is that it takes the Greek in its own right seriously. Although there is no way of reaching certainty in this matter, it is important to try to see if *κατοικέω* may point to a group of “settlers” as opposed to *ἐνοικέω*.

The causal particle *διότι* in verse 5b introduces the reason for the lawlessness of the *γῆ*. Its inhabitants “transgressed the law (*παρέβησαν τὸν νόμον*).” The translator’s use of the singular “law” for plural “laws” is striking (cf. discussion under part 1 ch. 2 in the present study). It has been suggested that he betrayed his theological bias in using the singular “law.”<sup>33</sup> It is probable that the transgression of the law has to do with changing the “ordinances”: *ἠλλάξαν τὰ προστάγματα* (Isa 24:5c). *Ἀλλάσσω* + *πρόσταγμα* appear only here in the LXX. In Isaiah, the verb *ἀλλάσσω* occurs only in 24:5; 40:31; 41:1. But the pair *νόμος/προστάγματα* (plural) occurs often as synonyms.<sup>34</sup> In Isa 24:5, the pair *νόμος/προστάγματα* should also be taken as synonyms. For that reason, it seems better to see the use of the verb *ἀλλάσσω* as a further clarification of the previous “to transgress.” The meaning of the transgression is that the “settlers” of the earth changed the ordinances of the law. It is interesting to note that the

30. *Διά* followed by an acc. expresses cause, cf. Herbert W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar for Colleges* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920), §1685:b.

31. LSJ, 928. See also MM, 338; Michel Casevitz, *Le vocabulaire de la colonisation en grec ancien. Étude lexicologique: les familles de κτίζω et de οἰκέω–οἰκίζω* (Études et Commentaires 97; Paris: Klincksieck, 1985), 162–63; GELS, 240, 391.

32. LSJ, 928: Ἐφέσιοι καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες.

33. Ernst Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaja 24–27,” ZAW 22 (1902): 49; Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 104–5; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 66, 131–34.

34. Exod 18:16, 20; Lev 19:37; 26:46; 2 Chr 31:21; 33:8; Ezra 7:10; Neh 9:13, 14; Tob 14:9; 1 Macc 10:14; 2 Macc 1:4; 2:2; Ps 14:2; Amos 2:4; Mal 3:24; Jer 51:23; Bar 4:1. In a few places, the expression “the ordinances of the law” also appears (e.g., 1 Macc 2:68; 2 Macc 7:30).

theme of “changing the law” appears also in Daniel 7:25. There, the “fourth beast,” a reference to Antiochus IV, is described as “attempting to change the sacred seasons and the law” (להשנייה זמנין ודת; cf. also 1 Macc 1:44–50). If this interpretation is correct, the translator’s use of *κατοικέω* points to a careful consideration of the meaning of Isa 24:5–6a.

## 24:6

The phrase *διὰ τοῦτο* “therefore, for this reason” points to the first consequence brought by the transgression (24:5) of the earth’s settlers: “a curse will consume the earth.” The phrase *ἀρὰ ἔδεται* appears only here and in Isa 28:8. In the latter, the object of the curse’s consumption is “this counsel,” a counsel that has become greedy (28:7–8). Contrary to MT’s past tense verb, LXX has the future tense *ἔδεται*. For the translator, the curses of the covenant (Isa 25:5) will be a future reality. The use of *ὅτι* in Isa 24:6b presents the sin of the earth’s settlers as the main reason for its curse.

*Διὰ τοῦτο* in 24:6c–d introduces the consequences of the “breaking of the law” for the “inhabitants of the earth” in general. The first result is that they will become “poor” due to the curse’s depletion of the earth.<sup>35</sup> The phrase *πτωχοὶ ἔσονται* betrays an interpretation of *חרו* in line with the parallel clause *ונשאר אנוש מזער*.<sup>36</sup> At the same time, the translator has an interest in the term *πτωχός* (cf. comments to Isa 25:3, §6.1 in the present study). The second consequence is that they will become few in number: “a few men will be left (*καταλειφθήσονται ἄνθρωποι ὀλίγοι*).” Although *καταλείπω* is the standard equivalent for *שאר* in LXX Isaiah (cf. part 1 ch. 2 in this study), it is still important to ask the question as to why the translator decided to employ it here. This issue will be discussed later under Isa 24:14, §5.5.

## 24:7

Contrary to MT’s use of past tense verbs, LXX’s future verbs (“will mourn [2x], “will groan”) indicate that Isa 24:7 has to be taken as a continuation of Isa 24:6. The picture of the wine and the vine mourning has connections to the preceding section. First, the verb *πενθέω* already appeared in verse 4, where the earth and the “exalted ones” are pictured as “mourning.” This means that the mourning of the earth has consequences for the vine and wine as its pro-

35. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 222: “LXX’s Übersetzung ist wahrscheinlich nichts als eine Verdeutlichung des Textes: die Wirkung des Fluches wird die gänzliche Verarmung des Menschen sein, denn auf den Feldern kann infolge der Verwünschung nichts mehr wachsen.”

36. HUB.

duce. And, second, the picture of a curse consuming the earth (Isa 24:6) functions as an explanation for the mourning of the vine and the wine in 24:7. The earth's inability to produce yields the vine ineffective. As a consequence, "those who rejoice in heart will groan" because the wine as the source of their joy is no more. For a similar picture, see Joel 1:10.

Isaiah 24:7 introduces the phrase "all who rejoice (εὐφραίνω) in heart will groan (στενάζω)." Who is the subject of "all who rejoice"? In the context of Isa 24:7, the subject must be identified with the ὑψηλοί of 24:4. There, they are portrayed as "mourning" because of the ruin of the οἰκουμένη. Similarly, Isa 24:7 proclaims that they will "groan" because of the vine and wine's devastation.

It is also important to note that in Isa 59, "groaning" is the result of punishment due to "lawlessness" (ἀνομία; 59:3, 4, 6, 12[2x]) and "sin" (ἁμαρτία; 59:2, 3, 12). Isaiah 59:10 describes the people as "groaning like a dying man" because of the judgment that took hold of them (cf. 59:9–11). In the same way, Isa 24:7 proclaims that "the ones rejoicing in heart" will "groan" because of the curse which, due to "lawlessness" and "sin" (24:5), renders the earth unproductive.

### 5.3. ISAIAH 24:8–12: TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

- 8a: The joy of the drums has ceased;
- 8b: the arrogance and the wealth of the ungodly has ceased;
- 8c: the sound of the lyre has ceased;
- 9a: they were put to shame;<sup>37</sup>
- 9b: they did not drink wine;
- 9c: the *sikera* became bitter to the ones drinking it.
- 10a: Every city became desolate;
- 10b: each one will close their own house so that no one can enter.
- 11a: Wail about the wine everywhere;
- 11b: all the joy of the earth is ceased
- 12a: and desolate cities will be left
- 12b: and abandoned houses will perish.

24:8

The past tense verbs, as opposed to the future tense ones in Isa 24:6–7, suggest that Isa 24:8 starts a new paragraph. However, it is difficult to understand

---

37. So Brenton; Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)* 1:153 "they are ashamed," NETS "they felt shame," LXX.D "sie schämten sich," and das Neves "ficaram confundidos." But the passive of αἰσχύνομαι denotes "to be made to feel ashamed," cf. GELS, 17.

the translator's shift from future to past tense verbs in Isa 24:7–8 because Isa 24:8–12. seem to have important thematic links with Isa 24:7.<sup>38</sup> It may be that the past tense verbs in Isa 24:8 serve the purpose of linking it with the equally past Isa 24:4. If this is so, perhaps the translator aimed at discouraging further on the “high ones of the earth” by pointing to the “ungodly.” The use of perfect verbs may indicate that the cessation of the “ungodly's wealth” in Isa 24:8 functions as the reason for the mourning of the “high ones of the earth” mentioned in Isa 24:4. At the same time, those perfect verbs may also indicate that Isa 24:8 conveys background information for the actions described in Isa 24:9.

Stylistically, clauses 8a, 8c parallel each other as they both mention musical instruments. Clause 8b stands out, as it does not refer to musical instruments but to the cessation of the “arrogance” and the “wealth of the ungodly” (πέπαυται αὐθάδεια καὶ πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν).

As noted in part 1 ch. 2 in the present study, the phrase αὐθάδεια καὶ πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν “the arrogance and the wealth of the ungodly” for MT's נַאֲשׁוּ עַל־יָי “the uproar of the jubilant” catches one's attention.<sup>39</sup> Das Neves has argued that the expression above refers to an unfaithful class of Jews, more particularly to their leaders.<sup>40</sup> However, as will become clear later, the ἀσεβῶν does not refer to Jewish leaders but to non-Jews (cf. comments on Isa 25:1–8, §6.1–2 in this work). For now, it is important to discuss the question as to how αὐθάδεια καὶ πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν fits in its literary context.

First, the translator's introduction of the ἀσεβῶν “ungodly” is in line with the concept of the “earth behaving lawlessly” in Isa 24:5–6 and with the idea that the “settlers” broke the “law,” “changed the ordinances,” and, ultimately, “sinned.” It is clear that the translator interpreted Isa 24:8 in light of Isa 24:5–6 by his introduction of the ἀσεβῆς motif. Second, in LXX Isa 24–26, the theme of the ἀσεβῆς is important. Besides contrasting with the εὐσεβῆς “godly” (Isa 24:16), it plays a major role in Isa 25:1–5, where it figures prominently in contradistinction to MT (cf. comments on Isa 25:1–5, §6.1 in the present study). Third, the “ruining of the earth” (Isa 24:1, 3) further described with the mention of a “curse” (Isa 24:6) rendered the earth unproductive. It affected the production of wine (Isa 24:7) which, in turn, hurt the revenue of the “ungodly”

38. Cf. the discussion of this problem in Liebmann, “Der Text,” 32.

39. Although the noun αὐθάδεια is a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX, its cognate αὐθάδης appears in Gen 49:3, 7; Prov 21:24; Titus 1:7; 2 Pet 2:10, where it has the nuance of “self-willed, arrogant” (GELS, 102). For a fuller discussion of αὐθάδης, cf. TLNT, 229–30. Αὐθάδεια also appears in papyri sources with the meaning “arrogance” (cf. Friedrich Preisigke et al., *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder usw. aus Ägypten* [Berlin: Erben, 1925], 235).

40. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 194.



(Isa 24:8). Fourth, it is possible that the translator interpreted the image of “merrymaking” in Isa 24:7–8 as a sign of the “ungodly’s” arrogance. As will be seen below (§6.2), a similar interpretation is found in LXX Isa 25:6–8. And, fifth, the theme of the cessation of the “arrogance of the ungodly” resonates well with the depiction of the “mourning” of the “high ones of the earth” in Isa 24:4. It seems that the translator had in mind a powerful group that held control over the *οἰκουμένη*. The latter’s demise signals the former’s downfall.

On the level of the book of Isaiah as a whole, a similar theme appears in LXX Isa 29:5, where the phrase *ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν ἀσεβῶν* “the wealth of the ungodly” stands for MT’s *המון עריצים/המון זרִיך* “the multitude of your foreigners/the multitude of the tyrants.” There, the “wealth of the ungodly” is further identified with the “wealth of all the nations (*ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν ἐθνῶν πάντων*)” (29:7). The text relates that these nations marched against Jerusalem and mount Zion (29:7, 8). It seems that the “wealth of the ungodly/nations” was used to forge and sustain war against Jerusalem/Zion. For that reason, Isa 29:5–8 proclaims that their wealth will pass “suddenly” (29:5). As will be seen below (§6.1–2), LXX Isa 25:5, 6–8 indicate the translator’s group found themselves under the oppressive control of the “ungodly,” who were occupying mount Zion. It seems that the translator interpreted the prophecy against the *οἰκουμένη* in Isa 24:1–3 as the demise of the “ungodly’s” ability to use their wealth to keep their oppressive control of Zion/Jerusalem (cf. comments on LXX Isa 25:5, 6–8, §6.1–2 in this study).

If this interpretation is correct, it implies that the phrase *αὐθάδεια καὶ πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν* did not arise from a mistake. Rather, it points to the translator’s unique interpretation of his *Vorlage*. It further implies that an interpretation of Hebrew Isa 24 preceded the process of translation. The introduction of the “ungodly” in Isa 24:8 not only fits in well with what preceded it but also with what follows (cf. comments on Isa 24:9–23 [§5.3–7]; 25:1–8 [§6.1–2]). Thus, it becomes clear that the translator already had an interpretation in mind before he began his translation work.

#### 24:9

Part 1 ch. 2 raised the question as to whether *ἤσχύνθησαν* “they were put to shame” (Isa 24:9) coheres with its literary context. It can now be seen that it does. It is important to note once again that the “curse upon the earth” directly affects the “ungodly.” The drying up of the “vine” (Isa 24:7) meant “no wealth, and shame” (Isa 24:8–9). The translator’s reading of *בשִׁיר* as *בוש* reveals his understanding that 24:8a is a reference to the shame of the ungodly ones as their wealth came to an end. Consequently, “they were put to shame.” The plural *ἤσχύνθησαν* has the plural *ἀσεβῶν* “ungodly” (Isa 24:8) as



its subject. The form ἡσυχύνθησαν further parallels the plural ἔπιον. The perfect verbs in Isa 24:8 give the reason for the “shame of the ungodly.” The general sense is that the cessation of the ungodly’s wealth brought them shame. The use of past tense verbs in the LXX fits in with the past tense verbs in Isa 24:8, 10–11. The past tense verbs perhaps aimed at making clear that Isa 24:9 goes with what precedes it, presenting the consequences of the “cessation of the ungodly’s wealth.” If this is correct, his reading ἡσυχύνθησαν was hardly the result of a mistake. Rather, it attests to a unique interpretation of his *Vorlage*. For the translator, the cessation of the “wine and drums” points to the “shame” of the ungodly.

#### 24:10

Isaiah 24:10 focuses on the “cities” of the “ungodly.” That the “cities” here belong to the “ungodly” (24:8) will become clear in Isa 25:2. Whereas MT Isa 24:10 mentions only one city (קריית תהו), two or more cities are envisaged in the LXX (πᾶσα πόλις “every city”). Isa 24:10a reads: “every city was made desolate.” Part 1 ch. 2 in this study noted that the use of ἐρημώω here is striking. The phrase ἡρημώθη πᾶσα πόλις parallels the similar καὶ καταλειφθήσονται πόλεις ἔρημοι “and cities will be left desolate” for MT’s נשאר בעיר שמה “desolation remained in the city” (24:12). Furthermore, the theme of “desolate cities” accords well with LXX Isa 25:2, which describes the destruction of the “cities(y)” of the “ungodly.” These links suggest that the translator purposefully harmonized Isa 24:10, 12 by his use of the lexeme ἐρημώω. This harmonization becomes even clearer through the translator’s use of πόλις in the plural for קריה “city” in the singular (cf. Isa 24:12 [πόλεις ἔρημοι/בעיר]; 25:2 [πόλεις/מער; πόλεις/קריה; πόλεις/מער]). As such, the utilization of both ἐρημώω and “every city” points to the translator’s interpretation of Isa 24:10 in the light of Isa 24:12; 25:2. Such a reading suggests an interpretation of the Hebrew on a “higher level” before the translation process started.

Another problem in this verse is the phrase κλείσει οἰκίαν. Das Neves proposed that the “ungodly” of verse 8 is the subject of κλείσει in verse 10.<sup>41</sup> Although κλείσει is singular, it could indicate each one of the “ungodly.” Another possible reading is to translate κλείσει οἰκίαν as “each one will close their own house,” indicating that people in general will close their houses and flee the city because of its destruction. A similar theme has already appeared in Isa 24:1, a verse that pictures the dispersion of the “world’s” inhabitants.

41. Ibid., 187.

## 24:11

The context suggests that the plural *ὀλολύζετε* is to be taken as an imperative addressed to the plural *ἀσεβῶν* “ungodly” (24:8).<sup>42</sup> Different from MT, LXX Isa 24:11a calls the ungodly to wail about wine everywhere. The reason for the call to “wail” relates to the “curse on the earth” that renders the “vine” ineffective (Isa 24:6–7) and, ultimately, affects the “wealth of the ungodly” (Isa 24:8). The phrase *πέπνυται εὐφροσύνη* in 24:11b is a harmonization with Isa 24:8. Consequently, *ὀλολύζετε* addresses the “ungodly” on account of their wine being gone. Further, the root *εὐφροσύνη* “joy” in Isa 24:11 has already appeared in 24:7 as *οἱ εὐφραίνόμενοι* “those who are rejoicing.” Similarly, the call “to wail” concerning “wine” recalls the phrase “they did not drink wine” in Isa 24:9. It is possible that the lack of wine led to the *ἀσεβεῖς*’s financial bankruptcy (24:8) and, consequently, to the destruction of their cities (24:10).

## 24:12

As was discussed in part 1 ch. 2, LXX Isa 24:12 presents several divergences from MT. While MT Isa 24:12a reads “horror is left in the city,” LXX has *καταλειφθήσονται πόλεις ἔρημοι*. Although Brenton, Ottley, *NETS*, LXX.D, and das Neves translate “and cities will be left desolate,”<sup>43</sup> the lack of the definite article in front of “cities” suggests that *πόλεις ἔρημοι* may be taken as the subject of the verb “to leave.” Consequently, a better translation would be “and desolate cities will be left.”<sup>44</sup> This translation fits in well with the parallel “and abandoned houses will perish” in Isa 24:12b.

The future “will be left” and the plural “cities” differ from MT’s “is left” and the singular “city” (see the discussion in ch. 2 in the present study). How does Isa 24:12a fit in its literary context? First, the picture of “desolate cities” parallels the phrase “every city is desolate” in LXX Isa 24:10a. The translator’s use of plural “cities” and the lexeme *ἔρημος* “desolate” clearly indicate that he read Isa 24:12 in light of Isa 24:10, where both plural “cities” and the cognate *ἐρημόω* also appear. Thus, the divergences in LXX Isa 24:10a were not accidental. Rather, they point to the translator’s unique interpretation of his *Vorlage* in the light of its immediate context. Second, the phrase *καταλειφθήσονται* has already appeared in LXX Isa 24:6 as a translation of *רָשָׁנוּ* “it will be left.” The conjunction “and” is a plus in Isa 24:12. It is possible that the trans-

42. Ibid., 196 and 69–75.

43. Brenton; Ottley, *Isaiah*, 1:153; *NETS*; LXX.D.; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 185.

44. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 145: “es werden übrigbleiben verwüstete Städte.”

lator intended to create coherence between Isa 24:6, 12 in his use of *καὶ καταλειφθήσονται*. According to his understanding, Isa 24:1–12 is about the destruction of the “world” that leaves behind “only a few men” and “desolate cities.” Otherwise, it is equally plausible that the translator’s *Vorlage* already contained the reading *ונשאר* (cf. discussion in part 1 ch. 2 in this work).

The second half of Isa 24:12 differs greatly from MT. Whereas MT reads *יכתשער ושאייה* “and the gate has been beaten to pieces,” LXX has *καὶ οἶκοι ἐγκαταλειμμένοι ἀπολούνται* “and abandoned houses will perish.” As was seen in the discussion in part 1 ch. 2, scholars have made several proposals to explain the divergences in the LXX. Isaiah 24:12b is a good example to show that a study of the LXX in its own right must be carried out before one attempts to explain its departures from MT. How does Isa 24:12b fit in its literary context? First, “abandoned houses” in Isa 24:12b parallels well with “desolate cities” in Isa 24:12a.<sup>45</sup> Seen together, Isa 24:12 accentuates the theme of complete desolation. Second, Isa 24:12 goes together with Isa 24:10. There too “every city is desolate” parallels “each one will close *their own* house so that no one can enter” (for a discussion of the meaning of Isa 24:10, cf. comments above). The theme of “desolation of cities” and “houses” ties Isa 24:10, 12 together. And, third, on the literary level of LXX Isaiah, the destruction of “cities” and “houses” is a theme that occurs elsewhere (cf. Isa 6:11). Whereas in Isa 6:11 the context seems to indicate that “cities” and “houses” belong to the land of Israel, in Isa 24:10, 12 the context is broader, referring to the “world” (cf. *οἰκουμένη* in Isa 24:1; “in the midst of the earth” in Isa 24:13).

The analysis above has several implications. First, it shows that the translator interpreted Isa 24:12b in the light of Isa 24:12a, 24:10, while making his translation of Isa 24:12 share thematic links with other passages in Isaiah (e.g., Isa 6:11). This type of approach points to a “higher level” interpretation of Isa 24:12 that paid considerable attention to its literary context. And, second, because Isa 24:12b coheres well within its literary context, one is in a better position to explain the process behind its production. It seems that the translator did not aim at rendering his *Vorlage* on a word-for-word level. Rather, he made special use of the context. The fact that LXX Isa 24:12 fits well within its literary context throws some light on how the translator arrived at its wording. He may have interpreted the idea of “the gate has been beaten to pieces” as indicating that people had already left their “cities” (cf. the image of “desolate cities” in 24:10, 12). Consequently, “houses” had been abandoned and, as such, they would be destroyed. If this is correct, explanations that work on the

---

45. Ibid., 145.

word-for-word model are fraught with difficulties.<sup>46</sup> A better approach is to look for explanations based on the translator's "higher level" interpretations that are often founded on the immediate and/or broader literary contexts of his source text.

#### 5.4. ISAIAH 24:13: TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

- 13a: All these things shall happen in the earth, amongst the nations,  
 13b: just as when someone picks off an olive tree  
 13c: thus they will strip them,  
 13d: even when the harvesting ceases.

#### 24:13

*NETS*, *LXX.D*, and *das Neves* took verse 13 with what preceded it. In fact, verse 13 shares with 24:7–12 the theme of agriculture. The mention of "olive tree" and "crop" points back to verse 7 where the "wine" and the "vine" appear. Furthermore, the expression "these things" seems to refer to the things mentioned in 24:7–12. Thus, it is important to take verse 13 together with verses 7–12. However, verse 13 also introduces verse 14 because the οὗτοι of verse 14 refer back to verse 13. Furthermore, the negative cry of the οὗτοι can only be understood in light of verse 13. Thus, verse 13 has a double function: while it closes the previous section, it introduces the one that follows.

The expression ταῦτα πάντα occurs three more times in *LXX Isaiah* (25:7; 41:20; 45:7), always in the accusative case. The only place where it occurs in the nominative case is *Isa* 24:13. The phrase ταῦτα πάντα refers to the picture of desolation of the earth and its consequences for the "ungodly" (*Isa* 24:8). If this is correct, verse 13 casts verses 7–12 as something that will happen in the future and that will take place "amongst the nations." At the same time, the past tense verbs in verses 7–12 may also indicate that part of that destruction had already started to happen (cf. perfect verbs in *Isa* 24:8–11).

A point for discussion is the interpretation of γῆ "land, earth." Whereas *Brenton* and *Ottley* translated γῆ as "land," "earth" and "Erde" are found in *NETS* and *LXX.D*.<sup>47</sup> As indicated in the comments to 24:4, in *Isa* 24 οἰκουμένη gives γῆ a broader scope, having to be translated as "earth."

46. On *Isa* 24:12, *Ziegler*, *Untersuchungen*, 144, had already aptly noted that "[*Isa*] 24, 12 könnte mit Not der *LXX*-Text auf den *MT* zurückgeführt werden" (emphasis added).

47. *Das Neves* used the term "terra" (*A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 189, 197). This term is ambiguous as it can mean either "earth" or "land" depending on the context. How-

LXX's literal translation ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐθνῶν "in the midst of the nations" (בתוך העמים) requires comment. Brenton, Ottley, *NETS*, LXX.D, and das Neves translated ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐθνῶν as "in the midst of," "inmitten," "no meio" implying that something will happen in a space that is set in the middle with the nations surrounding it. But the plural genitive τῶν ἐθνῶν indicates that μέσος should be translated as "amongst." The adjective μέσος used substantively points to an "inside space or expanse marked off from the outside." The proper nuance of μέσος varies depending on whether a singular or a plural noun follows. As Muraoka explained "when the following genitive subst. or pron. is sg., what is inside the expanse is perceived as a single whole—*inside, in the middle of*; if pl. or sg. collective subst., it is perceived as constituting of multiple units or entities—*amongst*."<sup>48</sup> As the plural τῶν ἐθνῶν follows μέσος, it is better to translate it as "amongst." Although this is a minor detail, it will be important for the interpretation of verse 13 discussed below.

Das Neves argued that ἐθνῶν refers to the people of Israel in the light of his study of ἔθνος passages in Isaiah, despite his recognition that ἔθνος may also refer to non-Israelites/Jews as well.<sup>49</sup> Contrary to das Neves, I hold that τῶν ἐθνῶν refers to "nations" in general. As was discussed above, ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐθνῶν must be rendered as "amongst the nations." This translation implies that something will happen in the "earth, amongst the nations" without specifying where in the earth and which nation is involved.<sup>50</sup> As such, ἐθνῶν should not be taken as a reference to ungodly Israelites, as das Neves had proposed, but to non-Israelites/Jews.

Another difficulty in Isa 24:13 is the identification of the participants "they" and "them" in οὕτως καλαμήσονται αὐτούς "thus they will strip them" (Isa 24:13c; cf. discussion in part 1 ch. 2). Who are "they?" Das Neves claimed the translator thought of a divine judgment, which would either come directly from God or indirectly through other nations as God's instruments. He further pointed to "the kings of the earth" in Isa 24:21 as support for his view of a divine judgment that would employ other nations as instruments.<sup>51</sup> However,

---

ever, it is clear that das Neves used the term "terra" in the sense of "land." For him, the scope of Isa 24:13 is limited to the land of Israel as is the rest of Isa 24.

48. *GELS*, 450 (emphasis original).

49. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 197, 207.

50. Cf. Deut 29:15 and comments in John Williams Wevers, *LXX: Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (SBLSCS 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 469. An expression similar to ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐθνῶν appears in Isa 2:4 but there it functions differently as the preposition ἀνά precedes it, being translated as "between." Ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐθνῶν also appears in Ezek 5:5, where Jerusalem is portrayed as established "among the nations" (cf. also Pss. Sol. 17:15).

51. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 189, 196.

the “kings of the earth” in 24:21 are not the instruments of, but the target of God’s judgment. The context of Isa 24:13c does not specify the identity of the “they.” However, links between LXX Isa 13; 24 (cf. comments to Isa 24:1, 10, above) suggest that the “they” may refer to the “Lord and his warriors” that come from “afar” to “destroy the whole world” (cf. Isa 13:5).

Who are these αὐτούς? In the context of Isa 24:13, the αὐτούς can be identified in both general and specific senses. In general terms, the αὐτούς are the “inhabitants” (ἐνοικέω) of the οἰκουμένη (Isa 24:1). Because of the Lord’s devastation of the “world,” only a few of the inhabitants remain (Isa 24:6). In its more specific meaning, the αὐτούς ought to be identified with the “nations” (ἔθνη) of Isa 24:13a. Below, comments on Isa 25:6–8 (§6.2) will make clear that the ἔθνη are viewed as the illegitimate occupiers of mount Zion (cf. LXX Isa 25:5). As the illegitimate occupiers of mount Zion, the αὐτούς must be further identified with the “settlers” (κατοικέω) (Isa 24:5) (cf. discussion on κατοικέω above). Included in the αὐτούς group are also the “ungodly” (Isa 24:8) and the “high ones of the earth” (Isa 24:4). The mention of the end of the ungodly’s wealth (Isa 24:8) coheres well with the judgment picture of Isa 24:13–14. The connection between the “high ones of the earth,” the “settlers,” the “ungodly,” and the “nations” will become clearer as the commentary proceeds. For now, it is important to note that LXX Isa 24:13 communicates a picture of harsh destruction for the group of the “inhabitants” of the “world” (Isa 24:1) and the group of the “ungodly” (Isa 24:4c, 5a, 8, 13a).

It is important to discuss the meaning of the picture conveyed in καλαμάομαι. Muraoka suggested that the first καλαμάομαι in 24:13b has the nuance of “gathering up left-overs,” whereas the second in 24:13c means “to rob sbd of everything” (emphasis original).<sup>52</sup> The phrase “even when the harvest ceases” (Isa 24:13d) supports Muraoka’s definition of the second καλαμάομαι above. The picture of Isa 24:13 is one of a harsh judgment against the group of the “ungodly.” More strictly, the picture of “stripping” the αὐτούς has an economic connotation as the judgment depicted in Isa 24 ultimately leads to the loss of the “ungodly’s” wealth (Isa 24:8).

#### 5.5. ISAIAH 24:14–16: TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

14a: These will cry with the voice

52. GELS, 358. Similarly, Frederic Raurell (“‘Archontes’ en la Interpretació Midràshica d’Is-LXX,” *RCT* 1 (1976): 340) had previously defined καλαμάομαι as “acabar de despullar algú.” Differently from Muraoka’s definition (GELS), most translated both instances of καλαμάομαι with the same verb in their respective languages, cf. Brenton “to strip,” das Neves’s “abandar,” Ottley and NETS “to glean,” LXX.D “abernten.”

- 14b: but the ones left on the earth will rejoice at once at the glory of the Lord;  
 14c: the water of the sea will be stirred,  
 15a: therefore the glory of the Lord will be in the islands of the sea.  
 15b: The name of the Lord will be glorious  
 16a: O, Lord, God of Israel, from the ends of the earth we have heard portents: hope to the godly one.  
 16b: And one will say: “woe to the ones rejecting—O rejecters of the law.”

## 24:14

Taken as a text of its own, the particle δέ “but” in LXX verse 14b introduces a contrast between the οὔτοι “these” in verse 14a and the οἱ δὲ καταλειφθέντες “the ones left” of verse 14b.<sup>53</sup> LXX verse 14 envisions, therefore, two classes of people. As such, it is important to find out the identity of the ones who “cry out” in verse 14a and the “ones who are left on the earth” in verse 14b.

The translator’s use of οὔτοι suggests that he has αὐτούς “them” (Isa 24:13c) and the ἐθνῶν “nations” (Isa 24:13a) in mind.<sup>54</sup> In LXX Isa 24, verses 8–12 form a literary unit. In this unit, it is better to identify masculine plural αὐτούς/ἐθνῶν with the masculine plural ἄσεβῶν “ungodly ones” of verse 8b. They are described as “put to shame” (ἡσχύνθησαν) in verse 9a and are called to “wail” (ὀλολύζετε) in verse 11a. Part 1 ch. 2 noted that the use of βοάω “to cry out” catches one’s attention. It now becomes clear that the translator consciously picked βοάω to communicate the judgment that will come upon the “nations/ungodly.”<sup>55</sup> It has been correctly argued that the use of βοάω in verse 14a is related to the concept of “wailing” already present in ὀλολύζετε of verse 11a.<sup>56</sup> It should also be noted further that βοάω matches the picture in 24:7, where those who are glad in the heart are described as “sighing, groaning” (στενάζω). In view of this, the phrase οὕτως καλαμήσονται αὐτούς “thus they will strip them” is about the stripping of the ἐθνῶν/ἄσεβῶν of Isa 24:8, 13, who are depicted as “crying aloud” in Isa 24:14a.

The second aspect of verse 14 concerns the identity of the plus “the ones left on the earth.” The question needing attention relates to this phrase’s present literary function. Clearly, the translator found a reference to “those

53. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 226; Le Moigne, *Le livre d’Ésaïe dans la Septante*, 356.

54. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 226.

55. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 59.

56. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 226.



who are left on the earth” in the harvest picture of Isa 24:13.<sup>57</sup> Further, the use of καταλείπω in Isa 24:6, 14 indicates that the “ones left on the earth” be identified with the “few men” of 24:6. For the translator, the “few spared men” “will rejoice together in the glory of the Lord,” a phrase that points to their salvation.<sup>58</sup>

The expression εὐφρανθήσονται ἅμα τῇ δόξῃ κυρίου deserves further comment. The construction εὐφραίνω + ἅμα + dative is rare, occurring only here and in Deut 32:43. Contrarily, the combination εὐφραίνω + ἐν/ἐπί + dative appears often (cf., e.g., Isa 9:2; 16:10; 62:5; 65:19). The rarity of the construction under discussion raises the question as to whether ἅμα is to be taken as an adverb “at the same time, at once” or as an improper preposition “together with.”<sup>59</sup> There is no good reason to take ἅμα as an improper preposition. Besides, ἅμα, in its usual function as an adverb, makes good sense here and should be translated with “at once, at the same time” (cf. LXX.D. “zugleich”).

Another issue concerns the translation of the construction εὐφραίνω + dative. NETS translated the phrase εὐφρανθήσονται ... τῇ δόξῃ as “they will rejoice ... *in* the glory” (emphasis added). However, it seems best to interpret εὐφραίνω + dative as “to rejoice ... *at* the glory” (cf. for instance, LXX.D.: “*an* der Herrlichkeit” [emphasis added]). Usually, to “rejoice in” requires the construction εὐφραίνω + ἐν + dative (cf., e.g., Isa 9:3). Contrarily, “to rejoice at” is conveyed with the construction εὐφραίνω + dative (cf., e.g., 2 Macc 15:27; Job 21:12; Sir 27:29).<sup>60</sup> The general sense of εὐφρανθήσονται ἅμα τῇ δόξῃ κυρίου is, consequently, that the “ones left on the earth” “will rejoice at the glory of the Lord,” that is, when “the glory of the Lord” becomes manifest on the earth.

In the context of Isa 24, the εὐφραίνω of verse 14 contrasts with the εὐφραίνω/εὐφροσύνη of the “ungodly” in verses 7, 8, 11.<sup>61</sup> Das Neves took εὐφραίνω in verse 14 as the translator’s deliberate input and saw in it the translator’s theological mentality.<sup>62</sup> For das Neves, εὐφραίνω is usually linked in

57. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:221.

58. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 226; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 59–60. Καταλείπω is also found in v. 12a in connection with the fem. πόλεις “cities.” As πόλεις is a fem. noun, it cannot be the subject of the masc. ptc. καταλειφθέντες in v. 14b.

59. For examples of the construction ἅμα + dat. in the papyri, see MM, 24.

60. See GELS, 306, for some of the examples cited above.

61. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 226.

62. Ibid., 236.



LXX Isaiah with an aspect of redemption.<sup>63</sup> *Εὐφραίνω*'s link with redemption is to be found in 24:14 and it reflects the translator's theology.<sup>64</sup>

Das Neves's remarks on the theology of the translator as reflected in *εὐφραίνω* raises an important methodological issue. As noted in part 1 ch. 2, *εὐφραίνω* often renders רִנַּן in LXX Isaiah. Should one then see the translator's theology in his use of *εὐφραίνω* in Isa 24:14? In my view, the answer to this question is "yes." First, although *εὐφραίνω*/רִנַּן is typical of LXX Isaiah, the same is not true for other LXX books or for early recensions of LXX Isaiah (cf. part 1 ch. 2 in the present study). As such, one needs to ask why the translator decided to employ *εὐφραίνω* for רִנַּן somewhat often in his translation. And, second, even if someone wants to argue that *εὐφραίνω* is just a literal, normal equivalent for רִנַּן in LXX Isaiah, it would still be important to ask how *εὐφραίνω* coheres in its literary context. In the context of Isa 24:14, *εὐφραίνω* communicates an aspect of "redemption" in view of references to δόξα in Isa 24:14–15. For that reason, one could argue that the translator employed his normal equivalent for רִנַּן because it made sense in the light of his other interpretations of his *Vorlage*. If this is correct, then *εὐφραίνω* would be a case where a "literal" translation coheres with other "nonliteral" renditions. In the end, *εὐφραίνω* would still point to the translator's own theology because it was his decision to employ that lexeme and not some other one for רִנַּן in LXX Isa 24:14.<sup>65</sup> Relevant at this point is Toury's remark that the retaining of certain features of the source text in the target text signals not to their inherent importance but the importance the producer of the target text assigned to them.<sup>66</sup>

The concept δόξα is important in LXX Isa 24:14–16 as it appears again in verse 15a (for כְּבֹדוֹ) and in verse 15b as ἔνδοξον without any connection with MT. As seen in part 1 ch. 2 of the present study, the pair δόξα/גָּאון is striking. Why did the translator introduce δόξα here? The expression δόξα κυρίου (24:14b; 15a) must be understood as a reference to "salvation." The same phrase parallels τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ "the salvation of God" (Isa 40:5), a phrase that has no counterpart in the Hebrew: וְרָאוּ כָּל-בָּשָׂר יְחָדוּ וְנִגְלָה כְּבוֹד יְהוָה

63. Ibid., 234: "o conceito *εὐφροσύνη* usa-se sobretudo em relação com o tempo da redenção, seja como fruto dessa redenção, seja pela própria redenção ou estado de vida usufruído naquele tempo" in LXX Isa 12:3; 25:9; 35:2; 45:16; 44:23; 45:8; 48:20; 49:13; 51:3; 52:8, 9; 55:12; 60:15; 61:10; 65:1 (emphasis original).

64. Ibid., 236.

65. Cf. ἀγαλλιάομαι/רִנַּן in LXX Isa 65:14 and cf. ἀγαλλιάσονται in σ'.

66. Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies—and Beyond* (BTL 4; Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1995), 12. See also the discussion in §1.2 of the present study.



24:15

The phrase τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ἔνδοξον, which differs from the Hebrew, indicates that the salvation of the καταλειφθέντες will serve the purpose of glorifying the κύριος. The same idea appears in Isa 24:23, in a phrase that also diverges somewhat from its Hebrew counterpart: καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν πρεσβυτέρων δοξασθήσεται/כבוד וקניו ונגד. The translator seems to be, therefore, interested in the concept of δόξα in his translation of LXX Isa 24 (cf. also Isa 26:10). The idea of the Lord being “glorious” must also be seen as a contrast to the οἱ ὑψηλοὶ τῆς γῆς (24:4) and the ἔνδοξοι τῆς γῆς (Isa 26:15) (cf. comments to Isa 24:4, above). Likewise, the description of the Lord as “glorious” further contrasts with those who are referred to in a negative way as the ἔνδοξοι in LXX Isa 5:14; 13:19; 23:9.<sup>71</sup>

The analysis of LXX Isa 24:14–15 as a text in its own right yields important results for grasping the process of the translation. First, the long plus “but those who are left on the earth” (Isa 24:14b) was most likely the result of the translator’s interpretation of his *Vorlage* as highlighting the theme of the “remnant,” a theme he found in Isa 24:6, 13. Likewise, his reading “these will cry aloud” (Isa 24:14a) reveals a unique interpretation of Isa 24:1–13 as focused on the judgment of the “high ones” (24:4), “the settlers” (24:5a), the “ungodly” (24:8), and the “nations” (24:13). Second, his use of δόξα for MT’s נִאֲרָא betrays the translator’s interpretation of Isa 24:14 in the light of Isa 24:15 and in the light of the theme of “remnant/salvation” that pervades the book of Isaiah. And, third, the translation “the glory of the Lord will be” for MT’s “glorify the Lord” not only parallels the plus “the name of the Lord will be glorious” (Isa 24:15b) but is also in keeping with the δόξα theme found in LXX Isa 24:13–14. While it is not possible to say with certainty, it appears that it is best to credit the translator with the reading “the glory” as opposed to MT’s imperative “glorify.”<sup>72</sup> The Greek text as it now stands indicates the translator read his *Vorlage* as referring to some act of redemption that awaits “those who are left on the earth” after the judgment in Isa 24:1–13, 18–20 is past. This reworking can hardly be seen as accidental. All these coherent transformations point to a “high level” interpretation and a distinctive consideration of the meaning of the Hebrew before the translator started his translation process. Consequently, the transformations in LXX Isa 24:14–15 cannot be explained simply on the basis of some mechanical error or the like.

71. Cf. discussion in Raurell, “LXX-IS 26,” 64, 81–82.

72. If this is correct, the noun כבוד in 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> and “the glory” in LXX Isaiah would be mere coincidence without having to imply that a text like 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> 24:15 once lay behind LXX Isa 24:15.

## 24:16

In the expression κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ, the articular nominative ὁ θεός is to be taken as a vocative as it appears in apposition to the morphologically marked vocative κύριε.<sup>73</sup> Further, the phrase κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ is a stereotyped phrase used in the context of prayer to God, usually as a translation of יהוה אלהי ישראל (cf. Judg 21:3(A); 1 Sam 14:41; 23:10, 11; 1 Kgs 8:23, 25; 2 Kgs 19:15; 1 Chr 29:10; 2 Chr 6:14, 16, 17; Ezra 9:15). The expression is so stereotyped that it occurs even when the Hebrew has only either אלהי ישראל (1 Kgs 8:26) or יהוה אלהי (1 Kgs 8:28). Whereas most commentators take שם יהוה as a direct object of כבודו and אלהי ישראל in apposition to שם יהוה (24:15), the translator interpreted יהוה אלהי ישראל as a direct address to God. Isaiah 24:16 is, therefore, cast in the format of a direct speech addressed to the κύριος.

The direct speech goes over “wonders” that have been heard “from the extremities of the earth.” Part 1 ch. 2, noted the scholarly discussion about the origin of the term τέρατα. Now the question must be asked as to what it actually means. In its literary context, τέρατα links with ἐλπίς “hope.” Das Neves expressed well the relation between “wonders” and “hope,” stating that the hope of the “godly” finds its basis in God’s marvelous deeds.<sup>74</sup> In its literary context, τέρατα more narrowly corresponds to the concept of salvation expressed in δόξα in Isa 24:14–15. But τέρατα also relates to the “wonderful deeds” (θαυμαστὰ πράγματα) of Isa 25:1, which consists in overthrowing the “city of the ungodly” (Isa 25:1–2). As will become clear later, “salvation” means liberation from the oppressive powers of the “ungodly nations” (Isa 25:8, 10). The connection between τέρατα, θαυμαστὰ πράγματα, and δόξα in the sense of “salvation” becomes clear in the light of Exod 15:11: δεδοξασμένος ἐν ἁγίοις θαυμαστὸς ἐν δόξαις ποιῶν τέρατα/פלא עשה נורא תהלת בקדש נאדר בקדש נורא תהלת עשה פלא. The theme of the overthrow of the “ungodly oppressive power” indicates that Exod 15:11 may have played a role in the translator’s use of τέρατα. There, too, the context is about the overthrow of the oppressive power of Pharaoh. If this interpretation of τέρατα is correct, then it becomes clear that such a term was not introduced by mistake. The translator seems to have interpreted Isa 24:16 with an eye on Isa 24:14–15, Isa 25:1–2, and Exod 15:11. This type of approach toward his *Vorlage* indicates a “higher level” interpretation that preceded the translation work.

73. For the voc. function of articular nom. nouns, cf. Conybeare and Stock, *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek* §50.

74. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 246: “O conceito τέρατα do segundo estíquio responde a ἐλπίς porque é ‘nas coisas admiráveis’ feitas por Deus que assenta a ‘esperança’ do ‘justo.’”

Another important issue is the plural *πετερύγων* “ends” for the singular כנף “wing.” Das Neves interpreted the expression “ends of the earth” as a reference to the Jewish Diaspora in the Hellenistic period. He argued for a universal scope of ἀπὸ τῶν πετερύγων τῆς γῆς, seeing it as a parallelism to ἐν ταῖς νήσοις ... τῆς θαλάσσης (Isa 24:15).<sup>75</sup> However, the parallelism between “ends of the earth” (Isa 24:16) with “in the islands of the sea” (Isa 24:15) is unclear. It is plausible, though, that the plural *πετερύγων* was the result of harmonization with כנפות הארץ/πετερύγων τῆς γῆς (Isa 11:12). But it remains unclear whether *πετερύγων* hints at the diaspora theme.

The singular *εὐσεβής* here is interesting (see ch. 2 in the present study). Some have interpreted the singular *εὐσεβής* as a reference to the faithful and godly Jew of the Diaspora who observes the law in contradistinction to the “ungodly” who break the law (cf. Isa 24:5, 16).<sup>76</sup> However, in view of the translator’s use of plural *εὐσεβεῖς* for singular נדיב/צדיק in Isa 26:7; 32:8, the question arises as to whether the singular *εὐσεβής* in 24:16 is to be taken in a collective sense, referring to pious Jews in the translator’s time. The singular term *εὐσεβής* appears only here in LXX Isaiah. Its masculine gender indicates that the term envisages a “pious man” (cf., e.g., Sir 12:2; 37:12 ἀνδρὸς εὐσεβοῦς). The only other place where a person is connected to “godliness” is Isa 11:1–5. This text describes the future rod/blossom from Jesse’s root as someone on whom the “spirit of godliness” (*εὐσέβεια*) will rest. Negatively, this future person is seen as someone who will destroy the “ungodly” (*ἀσεβής*) (Isa 11:4). Apparently, Isa 24:16 proclaims “hope” for the person with the “spirit of godliness” mentioned in Isa 11:1–5. There is a link between “the godly one” and the “godly ones” in Isa 24–26. The “godly ones” are characterized as “keeping the truth” (Isa 26:2–3) in contrast to the “ungodly” who “reject the law” (Isa 24:16). In this sense, the “godly ones” are very similar to the “godly one’s” positive attitude towards the law.<sup>77</sup>

75. Ibid., 245.

76. François van Menxel, Ελπίς. *Espoir. Espérance. Etudes sémantiques et théologiques du vocabulaire de l'espérance dans l'Hellénisme et le Judaïsme avant le Nouveau Testament* (Publications Universitaires Européennes: Théologie 23/213; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1983), 252.

77. For a discussion of the “godly” in Isa 32, cf. Arie van der Kooij, “The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Issue of Coherence: A Twofold Analysis of LXX Isaiah 31:9b–32:8,” in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives; Papers Read at the Conference on the Septuagint of Isaiah, Held in Leiden 10-11 April 2008* (ed. Arie van der Kooij and Michäel N. van der Meer; CBET 55; Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 47. A treatment of the identity of the “godly one” and its exact relation with the “godly” in LXX Isaiah will have to be addressed in future research.

The Greek οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀθετοῦσιν οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον has been variously translated. Brenton has “woe to the despisers, that despise the law.” Similarly, LXX.D has taken οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον as a relative clause: “Wehe *denen*, die untreu sind, *die dem Gesetz untreu sind*” (emphasis original). But there is nothing in the text that warrants such a decision. Ottley rendered “woe to them that set at nought; as for them that set at nought the law,” (comma original). As the comma after the word “law” indicates, Ottley took οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον as introducing verse 17. He perhaps took the plural οἱ ἀθετοῦντες as a *casus pendens* to the plural ὑμᾶς in verse 17. However, as will be argued below, verse 17 is best taken as the beginning of a new section. *NETS* has a different proposal: “but those who reject the law will say, Woe to those who reject!” *NETS* took οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον as the subject of the verb ἐροῦσιν. Even though *NETS*’s proposal is syntactically possible, it is strange that the very ones rejecting the law proclaim judgment on themselves. The definite article in οἱ ἀθετοῦντες has here a Semitic connotation and gives οἱ ἀθετοῦντες the force of a vocative: “woe to the ones rejecting, o rejecters of the law.” As such, an unidentified speaker (“one will say”) addresses the proclamation of judgment (“woe to the ones rejecting”) to rejecters of the law (“o rejecters of the law”).

According to the translator, the ἀθετοῦντες are rejecting “the law,” an expression without parallel in the Hebrew (cf. part 1 ch. 2 of the present study). “The law” appears also in Isa 24:5, where MT reads “laws.” In light of the papyri, Ziegler claimed that the meaning of ἀθετέω here is to render a stipulation powerless,<sup>78</sup> which makes sense in view of the translator’s use of νόμος. Important also is the observation that ἀθετέω appears in documentary papyri with the juridical connotation of “setting aside,” “disregarding,” and “annulling” “an agreement.”<sup>79</sup> Muraoka has offered a more nuanced definition of ἀθετέω as “to reject and treat as invalid and meaningless.”<sup>80</sup> As discussed under 24:5, above, the “settlers of the earth” were accused of “transgressing the law and changing the ordinances.” The idea of ἀθετέω as “rendering a stipulation powerless” (24:16), “annulling an agreement,” and “treating as invalid” fits in well with the idea of “changing the ordinances/law” (24:5). The ἀθετοῦντες are being judged on account of their illegal activities.

The picture of judgment against the ἀθετοῦντες for their illegal activities appears also in Isa 33:1: ἀλώσονται οἱ ἀθετοῦντες καὶ παραδοθήσονται

78. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 199: “eine Bestimmung außer Kraft setzen.” See also the helpful discussion in Michäel van der Meer, “Papyrological Perspectives on the Septuagint of Isaiah,” in van der Kooij and van der Meer, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 120–23.

79. Van der Meer, “Papyrological Perspectives,” 123.

80. *GELS*, 13 (emphasis original).

“the rejecters will be caught and delivered up” in an interpretation of the Hebrew.<sup>81</sup> Commenting on the meaning of ἀλίσκομαι in Isa 31:9; 33:1, Ziegler pointed out that in the papyri this verb has a penal connotation and indicates being caught in illegal conduct, which leads one to be arrested by the police.<sup>82</sup> A similar picture is found in Isa 24:16 in the expression “woe to the ones rejecting.”

The use of “law” in Isa 24:5, 16 indicates that the ἀθετοῦντες must be identified with the “settlers of the earth” (24:5, 6a), which, in turn, should be further identified with the “ungodly” (24:8). The identification of the ἀθετοῦντες with the “settlers of the earth” prompts the warning against the “inhabitants of the earth” in Isa 24:17 that there is a trap for them. Perhaps the unlawful actions of the “settlers/ungodly/rejecters” (Isa 24:5, 6a, 8, 16) affect the “inhabitants of the earth” in general.

The implication of the analysis above is that the production of the Greek translation was preceded by a unique consideration of Hebrew Isa 24:16 in the light of its immediate and remote literary contexts. First, the translator added the expression “the law” to give a coherent picture of his understanding that the destruction of the “world” is due to the breaking of the law (Isa 24:5; 20). Second, the translator employed “wonders” because of the context that refers to “salvation” (Isa 24:14–15) from the oppression of the “ungodly” (Isa 25:1–10 and comments in §6.1–2 of the present work). He also used “wonders” in the light of Exod 15:11, where the concepts “glory,” “wonderful,” and “wonders” occur. And, third, his use of “godly” contrasts with the “ungodly” of Isa 24:8, where MT has “jubilant.” For him, the destruction of the “world” brings “salvation” for the “godly” and “judgment” for the “ungodly.” It now becomes clear that “ungodly” in Isa 24:8 was the result of the translator’s overall interpretation of Isa 24, an interpretation on a “higher level” that certainly preceded the process of translation.

#### 5.6. ISAIAH 24:17–20: TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

- 17: Terror and pit and trap (are) against you, the ones dwelling  
upon the earth.  
18a: And it will be  
18b: that the one fleeing from terror  
18c: will fall into the pit,

81. For a discussion of the complicated relationship between the Hebrew and Greek of Isa 33:1, cf. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:268.

82. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 198; cf. also Preisigke, *Wörterbuch*, 1:56; GELS, 26: “to be convicted in a law-court” (emphasis original).



- 18d: and the one climbing from the pit
- 18e: will be caught by the trap
- 18f: because the windows from heaven were opened
- 18g: and the foundations of the earth will be shaken;
- 19a: the earth will be completely troubled
- 19b: and the earth will be in dire distress.
- 20a: The earth inclined
- 20b: and it will be shaken like a guard's shed,
- 20c: like the one who is drunk
- 20d: and intoxicated
- 20e: and it will fall
- 20f: and it will not be able
- 20g: to stand up
- 20h: for the lawlessness prevailed against her.

## 24:17–18

Scholars disagree on the placement of Isa 24:17. Whereas some scholars see verse 17 as the continuation of the direct speech initiated in 24:16,<sup>83</sup> others do not.<sup>84</sup> While the plural “you” and “inhabitants” could indicate a continuation of the plural “o rejecters of the law” in verse 16, the use of ἐνοικέω in verse 17 shows that this verse focuses on the “inhabitants” of the earth in general, much like in Isa 24:1–4, 18–20.<sup>85</sup> Contrarily, Isa 24:16 seems to have the “settlers” of Isa 24:5–6a in mind, especially because they are charged with “rejecting the law.” For this reason, Isa 24:17 was taken as the beginning of a new paragraph in the present monograph. The future tense “it will be shaken” (MT “were shaken”) in Isa 24:18 coheres with the future tense verbs used to describe judgment upon the earth in LXX Isa 24:3, 20. Taken together, Isa 24:17–18 portray the idea that the divine judgment against the “inhabitants of the earth” is inevitable.

## 24:19

Isaiah 24:19–20 forms an *inclusio* with 24:3. The parallelism between those verses is even clearer than in MT because in the LXX both verses are composed of only two γῆ clauses, whereas MT Isa 24:3 has two clauses referring to

---

83. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 1:153.

84. NETS; LXX.D.

85. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 240; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 252.



“earth” but three in 24:19. Besides, the syntactical composition of the Hebrew with infinitives in the *niphal* followed by verbs in the same stem differs from the *qal* infinitives followed by *hithpoel* verbs in 24:19. These differences are completely gone in LXX Isa 24:3, 19.

Although 24:3 portrays the earth as being plundered of its natural resources (cf. comments under 24:3, above), the use of *ταραχῇ παραχθήσεται* portrays the earth as suffering an earthquake.<sup>86</sup> This picture of earthquake explains why the earth “inclines,” “is shaken like an orchard’s guard shed and like a drunkard,” and “falls” (24:20). It falls because its “foundations” are shaken (24:19).

The use of *ἀπορία ἀπορηθήσεται* in reference to the earth (γῆ) is important because a similar picture appears in LXX Isa 8:16–22. This text refers to the law (νόμος) as being sealed (8:16) and describes the people as consulting “the dead with respect to the living” (8:19) instead of consulting a law (νόμος). As a result, “affliction, distress, and darkness—dire distress (ἀπορία στενή)” (NETS) are upon the earth. The picture portrayed in LXX Isa 8:16–22 resembles the one in LXX Isa 24:4–19: as a consequence of the breaking of the law (24:5) and its annulling (24:16), the earth is portrayed as suffering great distress (24:19). Thus, both texts share the belief that the breaking of the law brings disaster upon the earth. This, in turn, coheres with the use of *ἀπορέω* in Isa 24:19.

## 24:20

In 24:20, the translator returned to the theme of the earth’s “lawlessness” in his use of *ἀνομία*. This theme is clear in LXX Isa 24 as the cognate verb *ἀνομέω* was used to refer to the earth behaving “lawlessly” (Isa 24:5). Furthermore, 24:5 referred to the breaking of the “law” (νόμος), while 24:16 mentioned its annulling. This picture is not clear in the Hebrew as *הָנָה* appears in 24:5, *בָּגַד* and its cognates in 24:16, and *פָּשַׁע* in 24:20. In his use of *ἀνομέω* and cognates, the translator revealed his understanding that the picture of judgment portrayed in Isa 24 has the breaking of the law as its main cause. The use of *γάρ* “for” in place of *ו* in the expression *וּכְבֹּד* clearly indicates the translator’s understanding that the “earth” will “fall” on account of “lawlessness” against her. This “lawlessness” is linked to the “settlers’” breaking of the “law” in Isa 24:5–6a and to its “rejection” by the “ungodly” in Isa 24:16. Seen together, the translator’s decision to use *ἀνομία* and *γάρ* implies an interpretation on a “higher level,” an attitude that certainly preceded his translation.

86. GELS, 671.

## 5.7. ISAIAH 24:21–23: TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

- 21a: And God will bring (his) hand against the ordered whole of heaven and against the kings of the earth<sup>87</sup>  
 22a: and they will gather (them) together  
 22b: and they will shut (them) into the fortress and into the jail  
 22c: after many generations will be their visitation  
 23a: and the brick will melt  
 23b: and the wall will fall  
 23c: because the Lord will reign in Zion and in Jerusalem  
 23d: and before the elders he will be glorified.

## 24:21–22

As seen in chapter 2, the phrase **ביום ההוא** is not attested in the LXX. Taken as a text in its own right, it becomes obvious that the translator dropped that phrase to make clear that Isa 24:21–23 is linked to what preceded it.<sup>88</sup> God's judgment on the "kings of the earth" and the fall of the "wall" of their implied city functions as the climax of God's judgment against the "world" in Isa 24:1–3, 17–20. Although linked with the preceding verse, the change in participants from the "earth" to "God" indicates that Isa 24:21–23 starts a new subsection of Isa 24:17–23.

As in the previous unit, the future verbs in the present pericope indicate that an action in the future is envisaged. Compared to the Hebrew, the translator's focus on the future is mostly in line with it except for the last two clauses in Greek, where LXX has the future verbs *βασιλεύσει* and *δοξασθήσεται* for **מלך** and the nonverbal clause **ונגד זקניו כבוד** respectively. Thus, LXX Isa 24:21–23 is more consistent in its focus on the future than its Hebrew counterpart, a focus that certainly reflects the translator's own ideology.

Part 1 ch. 2 noted that the phrase *ἐπάξει ... τὴν χεῖρα* is striking. Why did the translator add *τὴν χεῖρα*? He used this expression to make clear that Isa 24:21 is to be understood as a judgment against the "ordered whole of heaven/kings of the earth." In LXX Isaiah and elsewhere, "to bring one's hand" signifies an

87. Das Neves (*A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 259) has no translation of *καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς* under the section "a tradução do Texto Grego." This was clearly a lapse as he mentions *βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς* later on the same page in his comparison of the Greek with the Hebrew.

88. Cf. Liebmann's claim ("Der Text," 246): "ob auch die Anfangsworte **ביום ההוא**, darüber kann nur der Zusammenhang Aufschluss geben. Nach LXX würde eine engere Verbindung mit dem Vorhergehenden erreicht werden."

act of judgment (cf., e.g., Isa 1:25; 31:3). The phrase “the ornament of heaven” requires further comment, as this phrase is not a straightforward translation of the Hebrew (cf. part 1 ch. 2 of this monograph). How should it be interpreted? Das Neves interpreted τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ as a reference to the “mundo dos céus,” that is, the angels. For him, the translator understood *על־צבא המרום* as a special class in heaven paralleling another special class on earth, namely, the kings.<sup>89</sup> However, it is unlikely that τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is a reference to the world of the angels. As Ziegler pointed out, the translation τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is based on Pentateuch passages (cf. Gen 2:1; Deut 4:19; 17:3).<sup>90</sup> A look at those passages shows that “the ordered whole of heaven” in Isa 24:21 is simply a reference to “celestial bodies” (cf. Isa 45:12: “heaven//stars”). Support for this interpretation can be found in Isa 13:10, where the similar ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ simply denotes “celestial constellations.” For the translator, God’s judgment against the “ornament of heaven” signals God’s judgment against the “kings of the earth.” In Isa 13:9–10, for instance, the “ornament of heaven” not giving its light signals “the day of the Lord” against the “whole world.” Although the identity of the “kings of the earth” is not immediately clear, such an expression may denote the “powerful mighty of the world.” If this is correct, then the “kings of the earth” parallels the “the high ones of the earth” mentioned in Isa 24:4. Isaiah 24:21 clearly portrays them as the object of God’s punishment.

The punishment of the “kings of the earth” is further portrayed in Isa 24:22. Literally, the LXX reads, “and they will gather together and they will shut into the prison and into the jail.” Das Neves has argued that the “kings of the earth” are not the object of God’s judgment. Rather, they are divine instruments against the “ungodly” of Isa 24:16, 20 [*sic*].<sup>91</sup> Das Neves based his position on two foundations. First, he argued that the preposition ἐπί has a neutral connotation, claiming that κατά would denote the idea of punishment, having to be translated as “against.” Second, das Neves mistakenly saw the verb πῆγνυμι “to position firmly” as the root verb for ἐπάξει. He then argued that πῆγνυμι in Isa 24:21(!) would have the meaning of “to grasp with the hands.”<sup>92</sup> Isa 24:21–22, therefore, is about God grasping the “kings of the earth” as instruments to punish the “ungodly.”

Contrary to das Neves, the expression ἐπάξει ... τὴν χεῖρα clearly denotes “judgment” in its occurrences in LXX Isaiah (cf. comments above). Furthermore, most translations add “them” as the direct object of the verbs “to gather” and “to shut” to indicate that the “kings of the earth” are the object of the

89. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 259.

90. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 117.

91. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 262.

92. *Ibid.*, 259–62.

actions portrayed in verse 22 (cf. Brenton, Ottley, *NETS*, LXX.D). Isa 24:22, therefore, goes over the imprisonment of the “kings of the earth.”

## 24:23

Isaiah 24:23 is important as it differs considerably from MT, especially in the translator’s introduction of “brick” and “wall” for MT’s “moon” and “sun” (see ch. 2 of the present study). As discussed in chapter 2, scholars have argued that the translator made mistakes in his rendering of Isa 24:23. But were the divergences in Isa 24:23 the result of mistakes? The following comments will offer a negative answer to this question.

The translator’s use of *τείχος* makes sense in its literary context. Van der Kooij has pointed out that *τείχος*, which usually refers to a “city wall,” may also have the same meaning as *τοιχος* (for *τοιχος* cf. Isa 23:13), which denotes “a wall other than that of a city.”<sup>93</sup> The *τείχος* of Isa 24:23 is best interpreted as a “city wall” (cf. *πεσεῖται τὸ τεῖχος* in Isa 27:3, where *τείχος* clearly refers to a “city wall” given the expression *πόλις ἰσχυρά πόλις πολιορκουμένη* “a strong city, a besieged city” in the immediate context). Isaiah 24:23 introduces the theme of the fall of the “ungodly’s city” in Isa 25:1–2 (cf. “foundations of strong cities”/ *πόλεις ὀχυρὰς τοῦ πεσεῖν αὐτῶν τὰ θεμέλια*). Moreover, the fall of the *τείχος* of the implied city in 24:23 strongly contrasts with the *τείχος* of the “fortified city” in Isa 26:1. Here *τείχος* has the positive sense of “salvation” for a “righteous” people (Isa 26:2). Given the fact that *τείχος* fits well in its literary context, the conclusion is that the reading “the brick will melt, and the wall will fall” is the result of a unique interpretation of the Hebrew on a “higher level” and not the consequence of a mistake.

Isa 24:23, therefore, envisages a day when the “kings of the earth” will be imprisoned and when the “city wall” of their implied city will fall. The reason for the collapse of this “city wall” is given in the *ὅτι* clause in 24:23: *ὅτι βασιλεύσει κύριος ἐν Σιων καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν πρεσβυτέρων δοξασθήσεται* (for the picture of the *κύριος* being glorified, cf. also LXX Isa 5:16; 33:10). The reason is that the *κύριος* alone will reign in Zion and Jerusalem. The collapse of the city means the overthrow of the kingdom of the “kings of the earth,” which is a necessary step for the establishment of the kingdom of the *κύριος* in Jerusalem and Zion. This future picture of the rule of the *κύριος* is the climax of Isa 24, for in that day the *κύριος* will reign in Jerusalem and Zion without any other powerful adversaries. It is interesting to note that in LXX Isaiah, contrary to MT, the reign of the Lord in Zion is still a future real-

93. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle*, 68.

ity. The reason for the translator's focus on the Lord's future reign in Zion, as opposed to present in MT, is found in the translator's situation of oppression under the "ungodly's/nations'" control of Jerusalem (cf. comments to Isa 25:5, 6–8 in §6.1, 2 below).

#### 5.8. SUMMARY

On its content level, LXX Isa 24:1–23 turns out to be a coherent text. It proclaims judgment for the "ungodly" and "salvation" for the "godly" (cf. comments on Isa 24:13–16, above). On one hand, there exists the group referred to as οἱ ὑψηλοὶ τῆς γῆς (24:4 מְרוֹם עַם-הָאָרֶץ), κατοικοῦντες (24:5a יְשָׁבִים), ἀσεβῶν (24: ἐλιזים), ἔθνῶν (24:13: הָעַמִּים) and the βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς (24:21 מַלְכֵי הָאֲדָמָה, the only place where MT and the LXX clearly match). They are the rich and powerful on earth (Isa 24:4, 8). This group rejects the "law" (τὸν νόμον/תּוֹרָה "laws" in Isa 24:5 and the plus τὸν νόμον "the law" in Isa 24:16) and is the leading cause for the "lawlessness" of the earth (Isa 24:5, 20). Besides, they are also charged with "changing the ordinances" (Isa 24:5; literal translation). Judgment awaits the group of the "ungodly" (Isa 24:4, 8, 13, 16, 21–23). As such, they are called to "wail" (ὀλολύζετε for the noun צוֹחָה "wail" in Isa 24:11) and are directly addressed—the vocative οἱ ἀθετοῦντες τὸν νόμον (Isa 24:16). On the other hand, there is another group referred to as the καταλειφθέντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (24:6d [literal translation], 14 [no counterpart in MT]), which is portrayed in positive terms (24:14b–15). For this group, there is "salvation" (cf. comments to Isa 24:14–16, above). Another group is also mentioned, namely, the "poor" (Isa 24:6c). The identity of this group will become clearer in Isa 25:1–5a, 8 (cf. comments on these verses in §6.1–2, below).

The coherence of Isa 24:1–23 can sometimes be seen clearly in the translator's lexical choices. Note, for instance, how the translator used οἰκουμένη for אָרֶץ (Isa 24:1 ["free"]) and οἰκουμένη for תָּבֵל (Isa 24:4 ["literal"]). Interesting also is his use of ἐρημόω and cognates for different Hebrew words: ἐρημόω/בָּלַק (Isa 24:1), ἐρημόω/תָּהוּ ... נִשְׁבְּרָה (Isa 24:10), and ἔρημος/שָׁמָה (Isa 24:12). The translator's use of νόμος and cognate words for several different Hebrew terms likewise points to an attempt at achieving coherence: ἀνομέω/חָנַף (Isa 24:5a), "to break the νόμον/תּוֹרָה "laws" (Isa 24:5b), "to reject the νόμον ([MT minus] Isa 24:16), ἀνομία/פָּשַׁע (Isa 24:20). Another clear example is his use of καταλείπω/שָׁאַר (Isa 24:6 [literal]) and καταλείπω in Isa 24:14 (MT minus). The examples above distinctly show how the translator's lexical choices were significant in lending coherence to LXX Isa 24:1–23.

The coherence of Isa 24:1–23 includes both "literal" and "free" translations. A clear example is the "literal" rendition "a few men will be left" (Isa 24:6), which coheres well with the plus "and those who are left" later in Isa

24:14. The same is true for the literal renditions “the high ones of the earth” (Isa 24:4), “the kings of the earth” (Isa 24:21), which cohere with the “free” translation “the arrogance and wealth of the ungodly” in Isa 24:8. As will be seen below, the “literal” translation “those inhabiting the earth will become poor” (Isa 24:6) coheres well with the theme of the poor in Isa 25:3–5a. Finally, the literal “the nations” in Isa 24:13 introduces a major theme of the judgment of the “nations” that will appear in Isa 25:5–8 (cf. comments in §6.1–2, below). Similarly, the “free” introduction of the “ungodly” in Isa 24:8 resonates well with the theme of the “ungodly” in Isa 25:1–5. The “free” use of the plural “cities” in Isa 24:10, 12 coheres very well with the plural “cities” in Isa 25:2; 26:5. In the same way, the translator’s “free” introduction of “hope” in 24:16 is in keeping with the same theme in Isa 25:9 (“literal”) and 26:4 (“free”) (cf. §6.2 in the present study). As can be seen from this short summary, both “literal” and “free” translations come together to form a coherent text as far as its content is concerned.

Finally, the coherence of LXX Isa 24:1–23, including both lexical choices and “literal” and “free” translations, points to a “higher level” interpretation of the Hebrew—a move that must have preceded the process of translation. The translator must have had a “higher level” interpretation of Hebrew Isa 24:1–23 and beyond before he started his translation. Note, for instance, his choice of νόμος and cognate words throughout Isa 24:1–23 or his decision to introduce the “ungodly” in Isa 24:8, pointing to a major theme of Isa 25:1–5. These and other examples (above) indicate that the translator had a particular interpretation in mind when he started translating Isa 24:1–23.

## 6

### LXX ISAIAH 25 IN ITS OWN RIGHT

#### 6.1. ISAIAH 25:1–5: TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

- 1a: O Lord, my God, I will glorify you,
- 1b: I will sing to the praise of<sup>1</sup> your name
- 1c: because you have performed wonderful deeds, an ancient, true plan.
- 1d: May it be so, O Lord!<sup>2</sup>
- 2a: Because you have turned cities into a mound,
- 2b: fortified cities so that their foundation might fall,
- 2c: the city of the ungodly will never ever be rebuilt.
- 3a: Therefore, the poor people will praise you;
- 3b: the cities of wronged men will praise you
- 4a: for you became a helper to every humble city
- 4b: and a shelter to those who are feeling despondent because of poverty;
- 4c: from evil men you will rescue them
- 4d: as a shelter for the thirsty ones

---

1. In LXX Isaiah, a noun either in the accusative or dative case follows ὑμνέω (Isa 12:4, 5; 25:1; 42:10). When an accusative noun follows, it is better to translate ὑμνέω as “to sing the praise of” as in the translation above. Examples of accusative nouns following ὑμνέω are also found in the papyri. A papyrus from 238 BCE reads: ὑμνεῖσθαι δ’ αὐτήν, while another one from 165–164 BCE has τοὺς τε θεοὺς ... καὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων ὑμνησεν. See MM, 649.

2. There is an unimportant difference in the translation of γένοιτο, which some translate simply as “amen” (Richard R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint [Codex Alexandrinus]* [London: Clay and Sons, 1904–1906], 1:155; Jean M. Coste, “Le Texte Grec d’Isaïe XXV, 1–5,” *RB* 61 [1954]: 45; J. C. M. das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías [Cap. 24 de Isaías]* [Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973], 165) while others as “may it be so” (Brenton; *NETS*, LXX.D). I have followed the latter convention.

- 4e: as a breeze for the wronged men.  
 5a: Like fainthearted men (we are) thirsting in Zion because of  
 ungodly men  
 5b: to whom you delivered us.

## 25:1–2

As was discussed in chapter 3, the translator's choice of *δοξάζω* for *רום* is unusual. The analysis of LXX Isaiah "in its own right" helps to clarify his choice. *Δοξάζω* appears here and at the end of 24:23 in the phrase *καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν πρεσβυτέρων δοξασθήσεται*, where it refers to the glorification of the *κύριος* in Zion. In using *δοξάζω* in 25:1, the translator intended to join 25:1 with the preceding verses in 24:21–23. In MT, Isa 25:1's link to Isa 24:23 is not immediately clear as different lexemes (*רום/כבוד*) are used. Contrarily, *δοξάζω* leaves no doubt about the connection between Isa 24:23; 25:1, which indicates that LXX Isa 25:1–5 must be read in light of and in conjunction with LXX Isa 24:21–23. In contradistinction, MT Isa 24:21–23 is usually taken together with Isa 25:6–8.

Isaiah 25:1c introduces the reason (ὅτι) for the praise in Isa 25:1a–b. The second person verb *ἐποίησας* continues the direct address to the *κύριος* that had been initiated in clauses 1a–b because the *κύριος* performed *θαυμαστὰ πράγματα βουλήν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινήν*. Part 1 ch. 3, above, already noted the single occurrence of *θαυμαστὰ πράγματα* in the LXX. How should *πράγματα* be understood? In its present context, *πράγματα* is best seen as referring to "deeds." As will be shown below, the content of *θαυμαστὰ πράγματα βουλήν ἀρχαίαν* is the overthrow of "fortified cities"/"the city of the ungodly." The singular *βουλήν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινήν* is in apposition to the plural *θαυμαστὰ πράγματα* as both phrases occur in the accusative case, albeit as plural and singular. The parallelism between *πράγμα/βουλή* is not completely strange because the same parallelism occurs elsewhere.<sup>3</sup> In Isa 25:1, *θαυμαστὰ πράγματα* is further qualified as a *βουλήν ἀρχαίαν ἀληθινήν*.

Part 1 ch. 3 noted that the translator's pick of the singular *βουλή* for the plural *צוֹת* is striking.<sup>4</sup> The translator could have translated *צוֹת* with the

3. cf. Prov 11:13: *ἀνὴρ δίγλωσσος ἀποκαλύπτει βουλὰς ἐν συνεδρίῳ πιστὸς δὲ πνοῇ κρύπτει πράγματα*.

4. The question as to whether the *βουλή* in LXX Isa 25:1 indicates the translator's belief that "prophesying is the revelation of an age-old divine plan" (Isac L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (MVEOL 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948), 110; see also Arie van der Kooij, "'Wie heißt der Messias?' Zu Jes 9,5 in den alten griechischen Versionen," in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen*



plural βουλάς just as he does when referring to human “counsels” (Isa 41:21; 47:13; 55:7, 8). Furthermore, his use of the plural θαυμαστὰ πράγματα immediately preceding would have given him a good reason to continue to use plural βουλάς (cf. Prov 11:13: βουλάς/πράγματα). What, then, is the reason for the translator’s use of singular “counsel”? The answer is found in a harmonization with LXX Isa 14:26. Whereas both places mention a divine “counsel,” MT has “counsel” in Isa 14:26 and “counsels” in Isa 25:1. The “counsel” of Isa 14:26 is against the “whole world” and against “the nations of the world” (ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην/ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς οἰκουμένης). As has been noted, the literary context of Isa 25:1 shares with Isa 14:26 the use of οἰκουμένη for the translation of עֲרָא (Isa 24:1). As in Isa 14:26, the Lord’s anger is directed against the οἰκουμένη (Isa 24:1, 4). Equally remarkable is that Isa 14:16; 25:1–5, 6–8 share a negative view of the ἔθνη “nations” (cf. Isa 24:13 and comments, §5.4 in the present study). The reason for this negative view has to do with the “nations’” control over Jerusalem/Zion. Whereas Isa 14:22 proclaims that the Lord will drive the “Assyrians” from “my land,” in Isa 25:5 an unidentified “we” group complains that they are living under the oppression of “ungodly men,” another pejorative term for the “nations” mentioned in Isa 25:6–8. That the Lord’s βουλή is directed against the oppressors of Zion/Jerusalem becomes clear when one looks at the content of Isa 25:1’s βουλή (see comments below).

The phrase γένοιτο κύριε deserves further attention. Whereas chapter 3 noted that the translator read מִנִּי instead of MT’s מִנִּי, it is necessary to ask the question as to the literary function of γένοιτο κύριε. This phrase functions as a request directed to the Lord concerning the “deeds, plan” that he will carry out. A “deed” is something that the Lord planned long ago (cf., e.g., Isa 28:22) that must be revealed or fulfilled. By inserting γένοιτο κύριε, the translator reveals his wish that the Lord’s “deed/plan” come true (cf. also Isa 25:7, discussed below). If this interpretation is correct, then a better explanation for γένοιτο κύριε is the translator’s interpretation of Isa 25:1 as referring to the Lord’s “ancient, plan/deed” that must be brought to fruition soon.

The construction ὅτι + second-person ἔθηκες clearly indicates that the content of the πράγματα/βουλή concerns the collapse of “strong cities/the city of the ungodly” (Isa 25:2).<sup>5</sup> In contrast to MT, LXX Isa 25:2 refers to “forti-

---

*Hermeneutik; Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag* [ed. Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, and Christoph Levin; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002], 159) will not be addressed here because it is not important for the purposes of this work. For a recent discussion of the issue, cf. Ronald L. Troxel, “BOYAH and BOYAEYEIN in LXX Isaiah,” in *The Old Greek of Isaiah* (ed. van der Kooij and van der Meer, 2010), 153–71.

5. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 46; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 166; Arie van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten*

fied cities” and to the “city of the ungodly.”<sup>6</sup> LXX’s reference to the “city of the ungodly” is remarkable. Part 1 ch. 3 noted the LXX’s reading “ungodly” for the Hebrew “foreigner” and the suggestions of a different *Vorlage* or mistake on the translator’s part. There are two important questions needing to be asked here. First, how does the reading “ungodly” fit in its literary context? And, second, in view of LXX’s reference to “cities” in Isa 25:1–b, it is important to research further whether the translator meant a specific “city.” As for the first question, it must be noted that the theme of the judgment of the ἀσεβής plays an important role in LXX Isa 24–26. As has been seen, Isa 24:8 proclaims the cessation of the “ungodly’s” arrogance and wealth. It will be seen below that Isa 25:5 mentions the “ungodly” as a group that has control over “Zion.” In a complete reworking of Hebrew Isa 26:10 (יִחוֹן רָשַׁע), LXX Isa 26:10 declared that the “ungodly has ceased” (πέπαυται γὰρ ὁ ἀσεβής//ἀρθήτω ὁ ἀσεβής) with very similar terms to LXX Isa 24:8 (πέπαυται αὐθάδεια καὶ πλοῦτος ἀσεβῶν). Finally, LXX Isa 26:19, in contrast to MT’s “the land of the dead will fall” (וְאֶרֶץ רַפְּאִים תִּפֹּל), LXX has “the land of the ungodly will fall” (ἡ δὲ γῆ τῶν ἀσεβῶν πεσεῖται). It becomes clear that “ungodly” in Isa 25:2 was hardly accidental. Rather, it indicates that the translator is responsible for the introduction of that term.<sup>7</sup> The term “ungodly” reflects his interest on the theme of the ἀσεβής (Isa 24:8 [עליזים]; 25:5 [זרים]; 26:10 [רשע]; 26:19 [רפאים]). Most importantly for our purposes, the term under discussion points to a “higher level” interpretation that took Hebrew Isa 24–26 as a reference to certain “ungodly” men (Isa 25:4–5) in a move that most likely preceded the translation.

As for the “city of the ungodly” in the singular (Isa 25:2c), it has been correctly put forward that the “city” in question was important. The events in LXX Isa 24 take place in the “inhabited world” (Isa 24:1: οἰκουμένη) and the translator’s use of τῶν ἀσεβῶν (Isa 25:2) recalls the reference to the “ungodly” (ἀσεβῶν) of LXX Isa 24:8. The latter characterizes the ἀσεβεῖς in Isa 25:2 as “the ungodly, rich and powerful” (Isa 24:8). The “city of the ungodly” must, thus, be an important, powerful city ruling over the οἰκουμένη. A city such as

*Testaments* (OBO 35; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 43; idem, “Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta,” in *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik* (ed. Henning Graf Reventlow; VWGTh 11; Gütersloh: Kaiser/Gütersloher, 1997), 16; idem, “Wie heißt der Messias?” 159.

6. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 46.

7. CTAT, 2:178; van der Kooij, “Isaiah 24–27: Text-Critical Notes,” in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27: The Isaiah Workshop–De Jesaja Werkplaats* (ed. Hendrik Jan Bosman et al.; OtSt 43; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 13. One could still argue, in line with Liebmann (Ernst Liebmann, “Der Text zu Jesaia 24–27,” ZAW 23 (1903): 255–56), that the translator’s *Vorlage* also read וְזִידִים in Isa 25:5; 29:5. The weakness of that proposal, however, is that it lacks support from ancient witnesses.

this is best identified as Babylon (cf. LXX Isa 13: 47). First, the picture of the “city” that will never be rebuilt (LXX Isa 25:2) is in line with the picture of Babylon, which will never be inhabited (LXX Isa 13:20). And, second, as in LXX Isa 24:8; 25:2, the concept of the ἀσεβείς being punished appears also in LXX Isa 13:11.<sup>8</sup> Thus, it is safe to conclude that the “city of the ungodly” is a reference to the important “city” of Babylon.<sup>9</sup>

Isa 25:2 proclaims that the city will “never ever be rebuilt.” First, the expression τὸν αἰῶνα, when used with a negative, conveys the idea of “never ever.”<sup>10</sup> Most translations employ the expression “forever” but this translation does not communicate well the idea behind τὸν αἰῶνα in this context.<sup>11</sup> And, second, the sense of τὸν αἰῶνα as “never ever” indicates that οἰκοδομέω must be translated as “to rebuild.”<sup>12</sup>

Part 1 ch 3 noted that LXX Isa 25:2a–b mention “cities” instead of MT’s “city/town.” The question was raised as to whether the translator’s *Vorlage* already contained the plural “cities.” The examination of LXX Isa 25:2 in the light of its own literary context strongly suggests that the translator himself was responsible for inserting the plural “cities” in place of the singular “city.” The plural “cities” in Isa 25:2 is best explained in the light of Isa 24:10, 12, where LXX has “cities” for MT’s singular “city.”<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, the plural πόλεις ὀχυράς for the singular קריה בצורה appears again for the singular קריה נשגבה “a fortified city” in Isa 26:5.<sup>14</sup> In Isa 24–26, the “fortified cities” contrast with the “fortified city” (πόλις ὀχυρά) in Isa 26:1. Finally, the collapse of the “fortified cities” is discordant with the “cities of ill-treated men” in Isa 25:3, where MT once again reads “city of the violent nations.” When taken as a text in its own right, it becomes clear that the translator had a particular “higher level” interpretation of his *Vorlage*, which focused on the plural “cities” in contrast to MT’s singular “city.”

It is also important to note the translator’s use of πίπτω here and in 24:23 above. The use of πίπτω connects Isa 25:2 and 24:23 together and indicates that the rule of the κύριος in Zion must be preceded by the collapse of the “wall” (τὸ

8. Van der Kooij, “The Cities of Isaiah 24–27,” 193.

9. Against van Menxel, Ελπίς. *Espoir*. 254, who identified in passing the “city of the ungodly” with Jerusalem.

10. GELS, 19. See also das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 165: “jamais;” LXX.D: “gewiss nie mehr.”

11. Brenton; Ottley, *Isaiah*, 1:155; NETS.

12. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 45: “La cité des impies pour l’Éternité ne sera pas rebâtie” (emphasis added).

13. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 254.

14. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 40; van der Kooij, “The Cities of Isaiah 24–27,” 192; idem, “Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions,” 63.

τειχος, 24:23) and, more radically, of the “foundations” (τὰ θεμέλια, 25:2) of the “strong cities.” As in the case of δοξάζω (25:1) above, the link between 24:23; 25:2 is not clear in MT as Isa 24:23 does not refer to the fall of a city wall as in the LXX. The translator’s choice of πίπτω in 24:23; 25:2, compounded with his use of τὸ τεῖχος in 24:23, betrays his intention to talk about the collapse of “fortified cities” in connection with the κύριος’s rule in Zion.

#### 25:3–4

In contrast with the “fortified cities” and the “city of the ungodly” in 25:2, the present verse focuses on the “poor people” and “the cities of wronged men” (25:3). The double occurrence of the expression “wronged men” (ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων) indicates that Isa 25:3–4 should be seen as a unit. Furthermore, the conjunction γάρ (25:4) links verses 3–4 together. Isaiah 25:3–4, however, is not completely detached from Isa 25:1–2. First, the phrase διὰ τοῦτο (25:3) clearly ties verses 1–2 and verses 3–4 together. This tie also makes clear that the collapse of the “fortified cities” and of “a city of the ungodly” (25:2) is the reason for the praise in verse 3. Second, as will be seen below, Isa 25:3–4 continues 25:1–2’s stress on “cities,” even though those “cities” are of a different kind. Isaiah 25:3–4 must, thus, be taken as a well-knit unit that relates to Isa 25:1–2.

It is important to note Isa 25:3’s introduction of the “poor.” Part 1 ch. 3, above, remarked that scholars have seen the reading “poor” as a mistake. However, it is clear that the translator introduced “poor” intentionally. The reading “poor” fits well in its literary context. It parallels the ideas behind “wronged men” (25:3), “every humble city” (25:4), “those who are feeling despondent” (25:4), and “fainthearted men” (25:5). Besides, the theme of the liberation of the “poor” will appear again in Isa 26:6. As such, rather than being accidental, “poor” was the result of a particular interpretation of the Hebrew in a move that most certainly preceded the process of translation.

Isaiah 25:4 presents a few interpretive difficulties. The first problem is the function of the nonverbal clause καὶ τοῖς ἀθυμήσασιν δι’ ἔνδειαν σκέπη (25:4b). Clause 4b is taken as a continuation of clause 4a, seeing the verb ἐγένου as an ellipsis in verse 4b. The general sense is that the Lord became a helper not only to “every humble city” (25:4a) but also “a shelter to those who are feeling despondent because of poverty” (25:4b). In this sense, the concepts in “helper” (25:4a) and “shelter” (25:4b) are parallel. Their parallel function is reinforced by their occurrence as the last word in their respective clauses. Similarly, “every humble city” (25:4a) parallels “those who are feeling despondent because of poverty” (25:4b) in both thought and clausal position in their respective sentences.

Another problem is the syntactical function of the phrases *σκέπη διψώντων* (25:4d) and *πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων* (25:4e). Coste, das Neves, and LXX.D seem to have taken *σκέπη* and *πνεῦμα* in apposition to the addressee in *ῥύση* (25:4c).<sup>15</sup> This option is commendable on contextual grounds. The direct address in the preceding clause (25:4c) would support taking clauses 4d–e as a continuation of that direct address. It is also possible, with Ottley and *NETS*,<sup>16</sup> to take *σκέπη* and *πνεῦμα* as nominatives and insert the comparative “as” to indicate the manner in which the “you” of clause 4c will save “them.” That is to say, the “you” will save them “as” or in the quality of a “shelter” and a “breeze.”

In short, LXX Isa 25:3–4 may be described as the praise of the poor for their liberation from the oppressive powers of the “fortified cities” mentioned in Isa 25:2. First, that the translator wanted to emphasize the theme of praise is clear from his double use of *εὐλογέω* instead of MT *כבוד/רא* (25:3). Second, contrarily to MT, LXX Isa 25:3–4 focuses on the oppressed, as several expressions therein indicate. The phrase *ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός* “the poor people” (25:3a; cf. MT *עם יצו* “a strong people”) parallels in terms of content *τοῖς ἀθυμήσασιν δι’ ἔνδειαν* “those who are feeling despondent because of poverty” (25:4; cf. part 1 ch. 3 of this monograph for the relationship between MT and LXX here). Similarly, *πόλεις ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων* “cities of wronged men” (25:3b; cf. MT *גוים עריצים קרית* “the city of violent nations”) matches *πάσῃ πόλει ταπεινῇ* “every humble city” (25:4a; cf. part 1 ch. 3 of the present work for the relationship between MT and LXX here). Also, the phrase *ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων* occurs twice (25:3b; 4e). It has been correctly argued that the translator employed *ἀδικ-* words to refer to Israel’s oppressors.<sup>17</sup> The language of oppression pervades LXX Isa 25: “the poor people,” “every humble city,” “the ones thirsting,” “fainthearted men,” and *ὄνειδος* (cf. comments on this word below). And, finally, the picture of oppression is also present in the term *διψώντων* “the thirsty ones” (25:4d). In light of the above, it is clear that LXX Isa 25:3–4 contains the praise of the oppressed in view of the collapse of the “fortified cities” (Isa 25:2). Thus, the theme of liberation from oppression is found in LXX Isa 25:3–4. The question arises as to the identity of the oppressors.

The oppressors must be identified with the “fortified cities” and “city of the ungodly” (= Babylon) mentioned in LXX Isa 25:2. First, the “humble

15. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 45, whose capitalization of “Souffle” indicates that he understood clauses 4d–e to be addressed to God. See also das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 165: “tu que és;” LXX.D: “(du).”

16. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 1:155; *NETS*.

17. John W. Olley, *‘Righteousness’ in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Contextual Study* (SBLSCS 8; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979), 122.

cities” (25:4a) sharply contrasts with the “fortified cities” in 25:2b. Second, the adverse fate of the “fortified cities” (25:2a–b) prompts the praise of the “poor people” and the “cities of wronged men” in 25:3a–b. Finally, the expression ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν “from evil men” (25:4c) refers to members of the “city of the ungodly (τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλις) in 25:2 as the concepts “evil men” and “ungodly” are ideologically parallel (cf. Prov 24:20). Having established the identity of the oppressors, a further question arises concerning the interpretation of the picture of the oppressed. Should the oppression be interpreted in religious—almost metaphorical—or in material terms? Or should it be read as a combination of both aspects?

Coste took πτωχός, ἀδικούμενοι, ταπεινός, διψῶντες, and ὀλιγόψυχοι as a sign of spiritual poverty or humility, an attitude he believed Judaism had developed. Although he proceeded to a discussion of each one of the terms above, his perception of πτωχός became central to him. For Coste, ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός denotes a pious people deprived of human security, counting only on God.<sup>18</sup> He contrasted ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός with the “fortified cities” and interpreted the latter in a metaphorical way: the “fortified cities” are cities that arrogantly rely on their own power. In the same fashion, he viewed ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός as a metaphor, indicating spiritual poverty.<sup>19</sup> He then interpreted the other terms in a similar way.

Coste explained ἀδικούμενοι as an epithet of the vocabulary of suffering that is applied to the Israelite community.<sup>20</sup> And as the term ἀδικούμενοι corresponds to ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός, Coste read ἀδικούμενοι as pointing to the misery of the Jewish community.<sup>21</sup> As for ταπεινός in πόλει ταπεινῇ (25:4), he asserted that it designates pious Israel as the receiver of divine rescue and as a group that searches for no defender other than God. Das Neves accorded with Coste and claimed that ταπεινῇ and βοηθός are not used in a political but in a religious sense.<sup>22</sup> Similarly, Coste interpreted διψῶντες in a metaphorical, spiritual manner, indicating a passionate people whose desire is the rescue that only God will be able to satisfy.<sup>23</sup> He also interpreted the term ὀλιγόψυχοι

18. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 53: “On est donc invité à voir dans le peuple ‘pauvre’ un peuple pieux dépourvu de secours humain, ne comptant que sur Dieu.”

19. Ibid., 52–53.

20. Ibid., 53: “Là encore nous nous trouvons sans doute en présence d’une de ces innombrables épithètes du vocabulaire de souffrance que s’applique volontiers la communauté israélienne.”

21. Although Coste refers to “Israelite community,” it is clear that he has in mind a Jewish community of the second century BCE, as he refers to it on p. 51.

22. Das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 171.

23. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 53–55.



“fainthearted” (25:5) as expressing those who are humble in their soul, rightly comparing the *ὀλιγόψυχοι* with the *διψῶντες* and the *ἀδικούμενοι* of 25:3–4. But despite Coste’s spiritualized reading of key terms in Isa 25:3–4, those terms can also be interpreted in more concrete terms.

Some of the terms Coste interpreted metaphorically can actually denote a more concrete situation. For instance, *διψάω* or cognate and *ἀθυμέω* are both used to signify people who had become thirsty and discouraged because of their city’s siege (cf. Jdt 7:22, 25). In that same context, *βοηθός* “helper” and *βοήθεια* “help” indicate a real liberation from a siege (Jdt 7:25, 31). Even the term *ὀλιγόψυχος* “fainthearted” denotes the psychological condition of a city’s citizen under a siege (Jdt 7:19 *ὀλιγοψυχέω*).

Moreover, the translator’s use of *δι’ ἔνδειαν* demonstrates that the cause of the “poor people’s” despair is the lack of food access. Though *ἔνδεια* appears only here in LXX Isaiah, the majority of its occurrences in the rest of the LXX denotes famine or hunger (Deut 28:20, 57; Amos 4:6; Job 30:3; Sir 18:25; Ezek 4:16; 12:19). In light of the reference to “fortified cities” and the “city of the ungodly” in 25:2, it is safe to conclude that the inhabitants of the “humble cities” (25:4) became poor because they were under the oppressive control of those cities.

As the context of LXX Isa 25:3–4 is the collapse of “fortified cities” and of “the city of the ungodly” (25:2) and the liberation of “humble cities,” I submit that the picture of “being poor,” “being thirsty,” “humble,” “discouraged,” and “fainthearted” all designate a political situation of misery or oppression that was caused by the “fortified cities” and “the city of the ungodly.” References to God as a “helper,” “refuge,” and “breath” all denote a concrete deliverance that God brought or would bring about through his destruction of the “fortified cities/city of the ungodly” in 25:2. As such, LXX Isa 25:3–4 is better seen as reflecting a more concrete situation of oppression and deliverance.

## 25:5

LXX Isa 25:5 presents a text-critical issue that has a direct bearing on its interpretation. S A<sup>1</sup>–26 Q<sup>mg</sup> and a number of catenae attest to the reading *εὐλογησουσιν σε*, whereas B Q<sup>txt</sup> L lack it.<sup>24</sup> Swete and Ziegler’s critical editions considered *εὐλογησουσιν σε* as a secondary reading, whereas Rahlfs took it as original. The same disagreement holds true in translations. Whereas Coste and das Neves took *εὐλογησουσιν σε* as original, Brenton, Ottley, NETS, LXX.D

24. Joseph Ziegler, *Isaias* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1939), 207.

saw it as secondary.<sup>25</sup> This divergence in the manuscript tradition and in translations calls for further discussion on the originality of εὐλογησουσιν σε.

The issue largely depends on the weight one assigns to Q. Ziegler viewed Q as the best witness to the original LXX text of Isaiah. In comparison with A, Q transmits the original LXX text more reliably and is almost completely free from Hexaplaric additions.<sup>26</sup> Contrarily, Ziegler pointed out that A contains several secondary readings whose cause lies in the influence of related phraseology from elsewhere in Isaiah, from LXX 2 Kgs 18:13–20:19 in A Isa 36–39, or even from the New Testament. Besides, A contains more Hexaplaric readings than Q, a fact discernible in additions found in A that also occur with an asterisk in Hexaplaric recensions.<sup>27</sup> It was Ziegler's justifiable predilection for Q over A and the former's nonattestation of εὐλογησουσιν σε that led him to consider the phrase under discussion as secondary.

The absence of εὐλογησουσιν σε in Q<sup>txt</sup> is difficult to elucidate. Ottley suggested that Q and B omitted it as a probable confusion with the end of 25:3.<sup>28</sup> However, his suggestion is unlikely as an explanation for an omission; it would be more appropriate to explain an addition. Considering that Q<sup>txt</sup> is the best witness to the Alexandrian group, it seems that Q<sup>txt</sup> nonattestation of εὐλογησουσιν σε is a strong argument to consider the latter as secondary in line with Ziegler's critical judgment.

Furthermore, it can be easily argued that εὐλογησουσιν σε in both S and A' was the result of a later scribe's addition influenced by the same phrase in 25:3 to clarify what would be the original difficult reading of 25:5: ὡς ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι διψῶντες ἐν Σιων ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἀσεβῶν οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας. The reading ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων, appearing in both 25:3, 4, could have led the scribe to insert εὐλογησουσιν σε after ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων in 25:4 in analogy with 25:3. For these reasons, I have decided to follow LXX Isa 25:5 as presented in Ziegler's critical edition.<sup>29</sup>

25. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 1:155: "[shall bless thee]; Coste, "Le texte grec," 45: "ils te béniront"; das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 165: "(Bendir-te-ão)." As seen above, Ottley thought the absence of εὐλογησουσιν σε in B, Q was a possible mistake in light of v. 3. Despite das Neves's translation within parentheses, he apparently considered εὐλογησουσιν σε as original. In his comments on v. 5, he followed Coste closely, reproducing extensive excerpts from the latter, including comments on εὐλογησουσιν σε (das Neves, *A Teologia da Tradução Grega*, 170–73).

26. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 29. Ziegler pointed to καὶ ἀνταποδώσω (= α' σ') and καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα αὐτῶν μετ' αὐτῶν (= σ' θ') in Isa 65:6, 23 respectively as the only two cases of Hexaplaric additions in Q.

27. Ibid., 27–29.

28. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 1:155n4.

29. Ziegler, *Isaias*, 207.



The phrase ὡς ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι διψῶντες ἐν Σιων “like fainthearted men, (we are) thirsting in Zion” merits further attention. Translations differ in their interpretation of 25:5a. Brenton translated it as “We were as fainthearted men thirsting in Sion” (emphasis original). His past tense “we were” is supported by the past tense “to whom you delivered us” at the end of the verse. While Ottley and *NETS* followed 25:5 closely, “like fainthearted persons thirsting in Sion,” LXX.D offered a more nuanced translation: “(Sie sind) wie kleinmütige Menschen, (wie wir,) die wir Durst leiden in Sion durch gottlose Menschen,” taking ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι as another title for the poor, oppressed people in 25:3–4, while viewing a “we” group as the subject of διψῶντες. For LXX.D, verse 5 offers a comparison of the situation of the “we” with the situation of the poor, oppressed people in 25:3–4. Among the translations above, LXX.D seems to offer the best interpretation of 25:5.

The comparative particle ὡς further supports LXX.D’s interpretation. The particle ὡς indicates that a comparison is meant. In the light of the reference to the “we” at the end of 25:5, it becomes clear that a comparison between the situation of the “we” with the situation of “them” (25:4) was intended. As the ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι and ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων of 25:3–4, the “we” of verse 5 also find themselves in a situation of oppression. They are “thirsting in Zion because of ungodly men” because they were delivered to them. Thus, it is reasonable to take the “we” group as the subject of διψῶντες.

Further support is found in the translator’s use of διψάω (25:5). This lexical choice recalls the use of the same verb in the phrase σκέπη διψώντων (25:4). The purpose of διψάω is to compare the “we” with the “they” groups of verses 4–5. Like “them,” the “we” group is thirsting in Zion. Similarly, the phrase ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἀσεβῶν parallels ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν (25:4). Clearly, the translator intended a comparison between the “we” and “them.” As verse 4 declared that the κύριος would rescue “them” from “evil men,” the “we” group finds themselves in a similar situation, under the oppression of “ungodly men.” Ὡς (25:5) points to a comparison of the present situation of the “we” group with that of the “them” in order to ask the κύριος for liberation in light of the liberation that he would give to the “them” group (25:3–4).

Part 1 ch. 3, above, has gone over divergent explanations for the phrase ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι and for suggestions that the phrase “in Zion” was the result of confusion. Before one can ascertain how the translator arrived at a particular reading, it is important to find out its function in its own literary context. The phrase ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι “fainthearted men” should be taken as a parallelism with ἀνθρώπων ἀδικουμένων “wronged men” (25:3, 4), τοῖς ἀθυμήσασιν δι’ ἔνδειαν “those who are feeling despondent because of poverty”

(25:4), and, by extension, to ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός “the poor people.”<sup>30</sup> As argued above, the situation of oppression in verses 3–4 is concrete and it relates to the oppressive powers of the “fortified cities” and “the city of the ungodly” (25:2). Although the adjective ὀλιγόψυχος appears only three other times in Isaiah (35:4; 54:6; 57:15), the verb ὀλιγοψυχέω occurs eleven times in the LXX (Num 21:4; Judg 8:4; 10:16; 16:16 [also in the A text]; Jdt 7:19; 8:9; Ps 76:4; Sir 4:9; 7:10; John 4:8). It is important to note that physical hunger may lead to the state of being ὀλιγόψυχος in Judg 8:4: ὀλιγοψυχοῦντες καὶ πεινῶντες “being fainthearted and hungry.” In Jdt 7:19; 8:9, the inhabitants of Baityloua become ὀλιγόψυχοι because their city’s siege had cut off their water access. Similarly, the condition of being ὀλιγόψυχος in Isa 25:5 denotes both physical and mental conditions. The “strong cities” (25:2) oppressive control over the “humble cities” (25:4) probably prevented the latter from accessing vital supplies, causing them to become poor physically and mentally. In this sense, the phrase ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι corresponds in meaning to the picture of being poor and oppressed in verses 3–4.

The analysis above casts an important light on how the translator arrived at ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι: he reasoned based on the literary context of Isa 25:1–5. As seen above, ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι must be seen as motivated by the immediate context’s emphasis on ἀνθρώπων ἀδίκουμένων (25:4[2x]).<sup>31</sup> Realizing that the translator reasoned from the context helps to explain the link between ἄνθρωποι ὀλιγόψυχοι διψῶντες ἐν Σιων with its probable source text. It becomes clear that the whole phrase “like fainthearted men (we are) thirsting in Zion” was an interpretation of כִּי כְחֶרֶב בְּצִיּוֹן “like heavy rain against the wall, like heat in a dry land” in the translator’s *Vorlage*. Rather than being the result of confusion, LXX’s reading was the result of a careful “high level” interpretation of the Hebrew that paid considerable attention to the immediate literary context.

The expression ἐν Σιων “in Zion” (MT: בְּצִיּוֹן) is important. As discussed in part 1 ch. 3, above, it has been suggested that ἐν Σιων resulted from a mistake due to the rarity of צִיּוֹן “desert” in the Tanach.<sup>32</sup> Although a superficial comparison between MT and LXX may lead to such a conclusion, when the LXX is analyzed in detail, paying attention to its immediate context, another explanation becomes more appropriate. The phrase ἐν Σιων recalls the same expression in LXX Isa 24:23, where it translates בְּהָר צִיּוֹן. There it is said that the κύριος “will reign in Zion.” The picture of the Lord reigning in Zion sharply

30. Coste, “Le texte grec,” 56.

31. Ibid., 44.

32. Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 190.

contrasts with the situation of suffering of the “we” group in Zion. In using ἐν Σιων in verse 5, the translator betrays his expectation that the Lord’s rule in Zion would come true to solve the burdensome condition of his group. Furthermore, the phrase “on this mountain,” which can only refer to Zion, will appear three more times in Isa 25:6–7, 10. These verses depict the “nations” as controlling Zion, while 25:10 celebrates its liberation from its oppressors. Additionally, “Zion” is depicted as oppressed in Isa 32:2. There, “Zion” is depicted as “a thirsty land” (ἐν Σιων//ἐν γῇ διψώσῃ, MT בארץ עיפה//בציון), awaiting the appearance of the “man” who will restore it. Isaiah 25:5 shares a similar theme in that the “ones thirsting in Zion” implies that Zion is under the oppression of an alien rule (Isa 25:6–8). The translator’s request that the Lord solve his situation (Isa 25:7) shows that Zion there, too, needs to be restored.<sup>33</sup> Ἐν Σιων must, therefore, be seen not as an accident but as the result of the translator’s unique reading of his *Vorlage* and of his will to produce a coherent text.<sup>34</sup>

The translator’s expectation that the Lord will bring an end to the suffering of the “we” group can also be seen in the phrase οἷς ἡμᾶς παρέδωκας. The verbal form παρέδωκας continues the direct address to the κύριος that had started with ἐποίησας in verse 2. In the immediate context of 25:3–4, παρέδωκας contrasts sharply in meaning with ῥύσῃ. Whereas God will save the “them” group from “evil men” (25:4), God delivered in the past the “we” group to “ungodly men” (25:5). As verses 3–4 foresee a time when God would deliver the oppressed from the control of the “evil men,” the translator’s use of “to whom you delivered us” points to his expectation that God would likewise deliver the “we” group.

Part 1 ch. 3 of the present work has shown that the phrase “to whom you delivered us” either has no counterpart in MT or is somewhat linked to תכניע. It is important now to discuss how this phrase fits in its literary context. Ziegler saw possible influences from Ps 27:12; 41:3.<sup>35</sup> However, it is more

33. For a helpful discussion of the relation between Isa 25:5; 32:2, cf. Arie van der Kooij, “Rejoice, O Thirsty Desert! (Isaiah 35): On Zion in the Septuagint of Isaiah,” in *Enlarge the Site of Your Tent: The City as Unifying Theme in Isaiah; The Isaiah Workshop—De Jesaja Werkplaats* (ed. Archibald L. H. M. van Wieringen and Annemarijke van der Woude; OtSt 58; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 19–20.

34. Jean L. Koenig, *L’herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d’après les témoins textuels d’Isaïe* (VTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1982), 147, who correctly saw evidence in LXX’s reading “in Zion” for a methodical treatment of homographs. For a more recent and similar stance towards the reading “in Zion” in Isa 25:5, see the very helpful discussion in Abi T. Ngunga, *Messianism in the Old Greek of Isaiah: An Intertextual Analysis* (FRLANT 245; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 154, 208.

35. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 117.

likely that the translator interpreted Isa 25:5 in the light of Isa 64:6(LXX 7): καὶ παρέδωκας ἡμᾶς διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν “you have delivered us because of our sins”/ותמוגנו ביד-עוננו “you have made us waste because of our sins.”<sup>36</sup> The context of Isa 64 is similar to Isa 25. Both places depict God’s people as living under the oppression of “ungodly men,” “nations” or “adversaries” (cf. Isa 25:5, 6–8; 63:18–19). By using the phrase “to whom you delivered us” in Isa 25:5, the translator betrayed the “conditions of his own time.”<sup>37</sup> Namely, that he was living under the oppressive rule of the “ungodly men,” who had control over “Zion” (Isa 25:5, 6–8).

## 6.2. ISAIAH 25:6–12: TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

- 6a: And the Lord Sabaoth will deal with all the nations on this mountain:
- 6b: They will drink joyfully,
- 6c: they will drink wine,
- 6d: they will anoint themselves with ointment.<sup>38</sup>
- 7a: On this mountain, deliver all these things to the nations
- 7b: for this is the counsel against all the nations.<sup>39</sup>
- 8a: Death, having become strong, swallowed [the nations] up
- 8b: and, on the other hand, God took away every tear from every face;
- 8c: he took away the disgrace of the people from the face of the earth
- 8d: for the mouth of the Lord spoke.
- 9a: And they will say on that day:
- 9b: “Look, our God, in whom we hoped
- 9c: and rejoiced in our salvation.”
- 10a: Because God will give rest on this mountain,
- 10b: and Moabitis shall be trampled down

36. Van der Kooij, “Rejoice, O Thirsty Desert!” 18.

37. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 112.

38. There is a disagreement in the text critical editions of Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta: est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979) and Ziegler, *Isaías*, as to the placement of the phrase “on this mountain” (2x) and “they will anoint themselves with ointment.” The latter was taken as belonging to v. 6 in this monograph (see more comments below).

39. The phrase ἡ βουλή αὐτῆς can be taken either in an attributive “this counsel” (Ottley, *Isaiah*, 1:157; *NETS*) or predicative sense “this is the counsel” (Brenton; LXX.D). For an unambiguous case of an attributive sense of the phrase ἡ βουλή αὐτῆς, cf. LXX Isa 7:7.

- 10c: as they trample a threshing floor with wagons  
 11a: and he will let his hands free  
 11b: and as he [Moab] lowered to destroy [someone else]  
 11c: and he will humble his pride  
 11d: on the things which he laid the hands.  
 12a: And he will make your high defense wall low<sup>40</sup>  
 12b: and it will come down as far as the ground.

## 25:6

There is a disagreement among critical editions on the position of *χρίσονται μύρον*, which Ziegler took as the beginning of verse 7 and Rahlfs as the end of verse 6. Rahlfs's clause division is highly commendable because *χρίσονται* agrees in person and number with *πίονται* (2x) preceding it. As such, in this monograph, the phrase *χρίσονται μύρον ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ* will be taken as the end of 25:6.

*Καὶ ποιήσει κύριος σαβαωθ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο* (25:6a). The third person reference to the *κύριος* (*ποιήσει κύριος* in 25:6a) clearly points to a break with 25:1–5, which addressed the *κύριος* directly throughout. Besides, the future *ποιήσει* with the *κύριος* as the subject indicates that 25:6a must be read in conjunction with Isa 24:23, where the *κύριος* also appears as the subject of future verbs (*βασιλεύσει/δοξασθήσεται*). A further link with 24:23 is the phrase *ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο* “on this mountain,” clearly referring to Zion (*ἐν Σιων*) in 24:23.<sup>41</sup> But LXX Isa 25:6 is not completely unconnected to 25:1–5. First, the phrase “on this mountain” (25:6–7) clearly refers to *ἐν Σιων* that also appears in 25:5. Second, the picture of abundant drink (25:6; cf. *πίονται* [2x]) contrasts with the image of thirst in 25:4–5 (cf. *διψάω*). Third, both pericopes share the use of *παράδίδωμι* (25:5, 7). Thus, LXX Isa 25:6–8 must be read in conjunction with both 24:23; 25:1–5.

In his commentary on LXX Isaiah, Eusebius of Caesarea captured the problem with verse 6 well when he asked after quoting it: *τί δὲ ποιήσει* “what will he do?” In fact, some time before Eusebius, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion had already felt this problem, seen in their addition of the Greek *πότον*: “drinking party; drink.”<sup>42</sup> In taking *ποιέω* as “to do, make,” most translations are forced to add a word or two to clarify the clause *καὶ ποιήσει κύριος*

40. For this translation, see *GELS*, 387.

41. See already Eusebius of Caesarea's comments on LXX Isa 25:6 in Joseph Ziegler, *Der Jesajakommentar* (Eusebius Werke: Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975), 9:162, l. 29–36.

42. *Ibid.*, 9:162, l. 26–27.

σαβαωθ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Brenton and *NETS* translate “and the Lord Sabaoth will make [a feast] for all nations,” while Ottley and LXX.D simply add “it” or “etwas.”<sup>43</sup> However, the verb ποιέω followed by a noun in the dative may convey the idea of “treating sbd in a certain way” or “dealing with someone” (cf. Isa 5:4).<sup>44</sup> It is in this sense that LXX Isa 25:6a must be interpreted.<sup>45</sup> The advantage of the translation proposed here is that there is no need to provide an object for the verb ποιέω, as is the case for most translations above.

As argued previously, ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο “on this mountain” is a reference to Mount Zion and also to Jerusalem (cf. 25:5; 24:23; also LXX Isa 10:12). The translation of 25:6a as “the Lord will deal with the nations on this mountain” raises the question as to whether this “dealing” was meant in a positive or negative manner. The answer to this question will become clear in the rest of the discussion on 25:6–8.

Πίνονται εὐφροσύνην πίνονται οἶνον κρίσονται μύρον (25:6b–d). The plural verbs in these clauses clearly have the plural “nations” (ἔθνεσιν) in 25:6a as their subject. The expressions “they will drink joyfully, they will drink wine” sharply contrast with the picture of thirst in verses 4–5. While the “we” group is thirsting in Zion under the oppression of the “ungodly” (25:5), the nations will be holding rich banquets in the same mountain. The expression “to drink joy” must be seen as an intentional hyperbole to single out the picture of overabundant joy that pervades 25:6b–d. It is interesting to note that “joy and wine” often occur together as the latter is the source of the former. A similar expression to “drink joy, to drink wine” appears in Jdt 12:13: πῖσαι μεθ’ ἡμῶν εἰς εὐφροσύνην οἶνον “you will drink wine with us for joy” (cf. also Jdt 12:17; Sir 31:28; Isa 22:13). Thus, the translator’s introduction of εὐφροσύνη was clearly not an accident but carefully thought out in analogy with the reference to “wine” further in verse 6.

The expression κρίω μύρον occurs only three times in the LXX (Jdt 10:3; Amos 6:6; Isa 25:6). Amos 6:6 is important because it shows that the drinking of wine and the anointing with ointment may belong together. As such, it is not surprising to find a reference to “anointing with ointment” in LXX Isa 25:6 in light of the previous mention of “drinking wine.” Taken together, πίνονται εὐφροσύνην πίνονται οἶνον κρίσονται μύρον paint a very positive picture for the nations. For a little while, the nations will hold rich banquets on Mount

43. Brenton; Ottley, 1:157; *NETS*; LXX.D.

44. Cf. *GELS*, 569 for more examples of ποιέω + dative in the sense of “treating sbd in a certain way.” The reader will also see there that the most common construction for the sense above is ποιέω + accusative.

45. Liebmann, “Der Text,” 266 had noted that the same nuance is true for the Hebrew: “ל עשה muss er infolgedessen im Sinne von ‘verfahren mit’ nehmen.”

Zion. Despite the seemingly positive tone of 25:6b–d, the nations’ activities on Mount Zion will be short-lived.

25:7

Ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ παράδος ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (25:7a). The phrase ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ recalls ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο in 25:6a, indicating that the mountain in question is Zion. Ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ also points to an important link between verses 6, 7. As verse 6 refers to the Lord’s future handling of the nations “on this mountain,” verse 7 emphatically urges the Lord to “deliver these things to the nations” on the same mountain.

As for παράδος “deliver,” Seeligmann argued that the imperative addresses the prophet because “it is his task to make God’s plan known to the nations.”<sup>46</sup> However, the immediate context lacks any evidence that the prophet was being addressed. Rather, the singular direct address παράδος must be seen as addressing the κύριος. Παράδος recalls the second-person sing. παρέδωκας at the end of 25:5. In view of the use of second-person singular verbs in verses 1–4 directed at the κύριος (25:1 ἐποίησας; 25:2 ἔθηκας; 25:4 ἐγένου; 25:5 παρέδωκας), it is clear that the addressee of παρέδωκας is also the κύριος. Likewise, παράδος (25:7) should be seen as a direct address to the κύριος.

What would then be the identity of the addresser? The addresser of the κύριος is a member of the group referred to in the “we” (ἡμᾶς, 25:5) and the “I” speaker in verse 1. After having told the κύριος that he was suffering in Zion because the κύριος had delivered (παρέδωκας) him and his group into the hands of the “ungodly” (25:5), the “I” speaker addresses the κύριος directly in verse 7 and asks him to deliver (παράδος) “all these things to the nations.”

The phrase ταῦτα πάντα “these things” deserves further attention. To what does it refer? Ταῦτα πάντα refers to the “drinking” picture in verse 6, which immediately precedes 25:7a. It is important to note that the “drinking” of the nations in 25:6 is the content of the Lord’s “counsel” “against” or “concerning” (see below) the nations. The addresser in verse 7 is thus asking the Lord to carry out his βουλή.

Is the “drinking” picture to be taken in a negative or positive sense? The answer depends somewhat on the interpretation of the preposition ἐπὶ. The main question is whether the βουλή is “against” or “concerning” the nations. Translations are divided with Brenton and LXX.D taking ἐπὶ as “upon; concerning” while NETS and Ottley interpreted it in the sense of “against.” Ziegler argued that the “counsel” of verse 7 is “against” all the nations. He

46. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 110.



found support for his claim in Obad 16, which portrays the nations' drinking in a negative way. Whereas MT reads "all the nations will drink continually and they will drink ... and they will be as if they had never been," the LXX has "all the nations will drink *wine*, they will drink, they will go down, and they will be as if they do not exist" (πίονται πάντα τὰ ἔθνη οἶνον πίνονται καὶ καταβήσονται καὶ ἔσονται καθὼς οὐχ ὑπάρχοντες). As in Obad 15–16, the "drinking" picture of LXX Isa 25:6 must be interpreted in a negative way: they will drink for a while but their judgment will come. Ziegler further pointed to the interpretation of the "drinking" of the nations in Targ. Isa 25:6, which also took the "drinking" of the nations in a negative way. It reads: "On this mountain the Lord of hosts will make for all peoples a feast *and a festival; they think that it is of glory, but it will be to them for shame, strokes from which they will not be rescued, strokes by which they will come to an end.*"<sup>47</sup> Moreover, Ziegler showed that the interpretation of the "drinking" in LXX Isa 25:6 as a friendly banquet to the nations goes back to Jerome, who was influenced by the New Testament reading of Matthew 26:29.<sup>48</sup> In addition to Ziegler's remarks above, one may highlight that in LXX Isaiah itself the image of "drinking" and "partying" carries a very negative connotation. In Isa 5:11–12, for instance, "drinking and partying" are criticized as they ultimately lead to disregard for "the works of the Lord" (NETS). Thus, the "counsel" of 25:7 is "against" the nations. That the "drinking" of the nations was meant in a negative way will become clearer below.

## 25:8

Κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύσας (25:8a). The first question that arises concerns the object of the verb κατέπιεν. Whereas Brenton added "men" after the verb "to swallow," Ottley, NETS, and LXX.D inserted simply "them."<sup>49</sup> In the immedi-

47. Bruce D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes* (ArBib 11; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1987), 49 (emphasis original). Targ. Isaiah reads as follows: ויעביד יי צבאות לכל עממיא בטורא הדין שירו זמן מדמן דהיא דיקר ותהי להון לקלן מחן דלא ישתזבון מנהון מחן דיסופון בהון.

48. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 145. It is interesting to note that a theological interpretation of Hebrew Isa 25:6 is already attested in the Pesh. (cf. HUB), which may reflect a Christian interpretation. Pesh. reads the Hebrew שמרים שמנים as a reference to a drink belonging to "our life-giver": "a preserved and fat drink, of our heavenly and mighty Life-Giver." "Life-Giver" is undoubtedly a reference to Jesus Christ, cf. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 273–74, also n. 45–46. Vg.'s *convivium pinguium convivium vindemiae pinguium medullatorum vindemiae defecatae* followed the Hebrew closely.

49. Brenton; Ottley, *Isaiah*, 1:157; NETS; LXX.D.



ate context, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη “all the nations” (25:7) is the best candidate for being the object of κατέπιεν.<sup>50</sup> Starkly contrasting with the apparent picture of blessedness for the nations in 25:6b–d earlier, 25:8a declares that the nations were swallowed up.

The reference to the nation’s banquet (25:6b–d) must be read as temporary. The nations will, for a while, hold banquets on Mount Zion, even while the translator’s group is thirsting under their oppression (Isa 25:5). However, the Lord will deal with them by carrying out his βουλή (25:7) against them. The past tense verbs of 25:8 (ἄφειλεν 2x) indicate that the Lord has started the process of bringing the oppressive rule of the “nations” to an end (cf. also 25:1–2, above).

The phrase ὁ θάνατος ισχύσας “death, having become strong” occurs only here and it is not clear what the translator intended. It is important to note that, in LXX Isaiah, “death” functions as one of the κύριος’s agents. In LXX Isa 9:7, it is said that the κύριος sent “death” against Jacob/Israel. The translator read the Hebrew דבר, “word” in MT, as “pestilence” (דִּבְרָא).<sup>51</sup> Likewise, “death” in LXX Isa 25:8 must be understood as an agent that the Lord sent to punish the “nations.”

Καὶ πάλιν ἀφείλεν ὁ θεὸς πᾶν δάκρυον ἀπὸ παντὸς προσώπου τὸ ὄνειδος τοῦ λαοῦ ἀφείλεν ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς (25:8b–c). As noted in chapter 3 of the present study, πάλιν is a plus in the LXX. It has been correctly noted that πάλιν is typical of LXX Isaiah because it usually occurs as a plus (cf. LXX Isa 7:4; 23:17).<sup>52</sup> The usual meaning of πάλιν in the LXX is “again.”<sup>53</sup> But it can also denote a turn of thought “on the other hand.”<sup>54</sup> It is this latter sense that is most fitting to 25:8b. There is a contrast between the actions of “death” (25:8a) and those of God (25:8b). While death swallows the nations up, God, on the other hand (πάλιν), has started to take away every tear from every face.

Different from MT מחה “to wipe out”/הסיר “to cause to depart”), LXX employed the same verb (ἀφαιρέω “to take away”) twice. This double use of ἀφαιρέω indicates that 25:8b–c must be taken together. As such, the phrase “every face” means the faces of the people in 25:8c and “tears” and “reproach” must be interpreted in light of each other. What is exactly at stake in the translator’s use of ὄνειδος?

50. Thomas Hieke, “‘Er verschlingt den Tod für immer’ (Jes 25,8a): Eine unerfüllte Verheißung im Alten und Neuen Testament,” *BZ* 50 (2006): 37.

51. Cf., e.g., Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2:156.

52. van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 72.

53. *GELS*, 521.

54. *LEH*, 457.

In the LXX, *ὄνειδος* may indicate the feeling of shame of those living under the control of foreign nations. In Joel 2:17, for instance, priests entreat the Lord: “spare your people, O Lord, and do not subject your inheritance to the reproach of being ruled over by the nations” (*NETS*; the Greek reads: *φεῖσαι κύριε τοῦ λαοῦ σου καὶ μὴ δῶς τὴν κληρονομίαν σου εἰς ὄνειδος τοῦ κατάρξαι αὐτῶν ἔθνη*; cf. also Mic 6:16).<sup>55</sup> Similarly, *ὄνειδος* in LXX Isa 25:8 denotes the shame of being ruled over by foreign nations. The “nations” are the “nations” referred to in 25:6–7. The past tense *ἄφειλεν*, different from future ones in MT (*וּמַחֵ/יִסִּיר*), indicates that God has started to take away the shame of the people, that is to say, the shame of being ruled over by the nations. Thus, verse 8 portrays two divergent but interrelated pictures. On one hand, God has sent “death” to swallow the nations up. On the other hand, that act also meant that God had started to take away the “shame” of the people, that is, the shame of living under the oppression of the nations.

At this point, a word about the “nations” (*ἔθνος*, 25:6, 7) and the people (*λαός*, 25:8c) must be said. In the comparison between LXX and the MT, it was noted that the use of *ἔθνος* as a translation of *גוֹ* is unusual. It is now clear that the translator purposefully employed it antithetically to *λαός* (25:8). The “nations” should be identified with the *ἀνθρώπων ἀσεβῶν* “ungodly men” (25:5), whose city is named “the city of the ungodly” (25:2). It is worth noting that God’s handling of the nations occurs “on this mountain” (25:6–7). As argued above, “this mountain” is Mount Zion mentioned in 25:5. The picture in verse 5 is that the “we” group is under the oppressive control of the “ungodly” in Zion. In verse 7, an unidentified person asks the Lord to carry out his *βουλὴ* in Zion, making it clear he expects the Lord will liberate the “we” group from the control of the “ungodly.” The past tense *κατέπειν* in 25:8 indicates that the Lord had started to liberate the “we” (25:5) group because “death” was swallowing up the nations. Thus, the translator interpreted Isa 25:6–8 as a judgment against the “nations” (25:6–7) and liberation for the “people” (25:8). For a similar picture, see Isa 24:13–16, §5.4–5 in the present study.

The reference to *λαός* differs from MT’s “his people” in LXX’s mention of only “the people” (*ἔθνος*; cf. also Isa 1:3, where *גַּם* was simply rendered with *ὁ λαός*). In its immediate context, *λαός* must be identified with *ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός* “the poor people” of 25:3. The “poor people” is described in 25:3–4 as being under the oppressive control of the “evil men” (25:4). The reference to “death swallowing the nations up” and to “God removing the disgrace of the people” (25:8) indicates that the “poor people” (25:3) have begun to be liberated. It

55. GELS, 498.

is interesting to note that, whereas 25:4 portrays the liberation of the poor people as a future reality (ῥύση), verse 8 portrays their liberation as something that has already begun. This interchange between future and past tense verbs can only be explained as due to the translator's view of God's liberation as something that has started but has not been fully completed.

## 25:9

καὶ ἐροῦσι τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἰδοὺ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐφ' ᾧ ἠλπίζομεν καὶ ἠγαλλιώμεθα καὶ εὐφρανθησόμεθα ἐπὶ τῇ σωτηρίᾳ ἡμῶν (25:9). It is important to discuss who the subject of the plural ἐροῦσι is. In its immediate context, the plural group "us" in 25:5 must be taken as the subject of ἐροῦσι. LXX Isa 25:9 introduces the response of the "we" group (25:5), which was occasioned by the liberation of the "poor people" (25:3, 8) from oppression. This explains LXX's "in our salvation" (τῇ σωτηρίᾳ ἡμῶν) for MT's "his salvation" (בִּישׁוּתָיו). Here one finds the language of the "we" (cf. "our salvation") group. After their liberation is completed, the "we" group will rejoice in the salvation that their God will have brought to them. Thus, the liberation of the "poor people" will prompt the declaration of the "we" in verse 10. It now becomes clear that Isa 25 envisages at least two different groups being liberated from oppression. These are the "people" (Isa 25:3–4; 25:8) and the "we" group (Isa 25:5, 9–10). The liberation of the former signals the latter's upcoming salvation as well as Zion's liberation from her oppressors.

## 25:10

That the liberation of the "people" (25:8) marks the beginning of the liberation of the "we" group is clear from verse 10a: ὅτι ἀνάπαυσιν δώσει ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο (25:10a). The conjunction ὅτι introduces the reason for the declaration in verse 9: God "will give rest on this mountain." The phrase "on this mountain" has already appeared twice (25:6, 7) and refers to Mount Zion (25:5).<sup>56</sup> It is significant that 25:10 declares that God will "give rest on this mountain." "Rest" (ἀνάπαυσις) indicates that the situation of oppression of the translator's group in Zion will be brought to an end. The future tense verb shows that this situation will occur in the short future, a picture that is in line with 25:6b–d's description of the nations banqueting in Zion for a little while.

Striking is the translator's use of ἡ Μωαβίτις for מואב, creating an equivalence that is almost unique to LXX Isaiah (cf. part 1 ch. 3 in the present study).

56. See Ngunga, *Messianism*, 126.

It seems that the translator was referring here to a region. As one scholar has remarked “this name [Μωαβίτις] was used especially in the Ptolemaic administration for the regions of the southern part of the Ptolemaic province of *Coele Syria*.”<sup>57</sup> Why did the translator employ Μωαβίτις here? The answer lies in his reading Isa 25:10 in the light of the oracle against Μωαβίτις (MT: מואב) in Isa 15–16. Like Isa 25:10, Isa 15:1 proclaims the collapse of Moabitis’s “wall.” The term τεῖχος does not necessarily imply a human-built wall but may designate natural walls. The latter connotation may well apply to Moab’s high mountains located at its border.<sup>58</sup> The same nuance applies to τοῖχος in Isa 25:12.<sup>59</sup> Another link between Isa 15–16; 25:1–12 will be observed below. For now, it is clear that the translator had in mind the southern region of Coele Syria in his use of Μωαβίτις.

## 25:11

It is not easy to make sense of the Greek ὃν τρόπον καὶ αὐτὸς ἐταπείνωσεν τοῦ ἀπολέσαι because the objects of ἐταπείνωσεν/τοῦ ἀπολέσαι are not clear. Brenton rendered the phrase above as “even as he also brings down *man* to destroy *him*.”<sup>60</sup> Differently, Ottley translated “like as he himself also humbled *him* to destroy *him*,” whose translation *NETS* followed.<sup>61</sup> It seems better to follow LXX.D and take Moab as the subject of ἐταπείνωσεν and “someone else” as its object: “ebenso wie *aucher* (Moab) (*andere*) erniedrigt *hat* *bis zur Vernichtung*.”<sup>62</sup> Although the relationship between clauses 11b–c is unclear, the sense seems to be that God will “let his hands free” to punish the region called “Moabitis” in a way similar to what an unknown “he” had done to someone else. Equally unclear is the identity of “his” in “he will humble his pride.” The difficulty here is that “Moabitis” is a feminine noun and, consequently, the masculine αὐτός cannot refer to it.

One important aspect here is the translator’s utilization of ἀπόλλυμι “to destroy.” While part 1 ch. 3 in the present study indicated that the reading ἐταπείνωσεν τοῦ ἀπολέσαι is the result of rereading לשחך השחך “the swimmer to swim” as השחך לשחך “he brought low to destroy,” it is important to ask why the translator did so. The answer lies in his interpreting Isa 25:11

57. Emanuel Tov, “Personal Names in the Septuagint of Isaiah,” in van der Meer et al, 427.

58. Van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 68.

59. Ibid.

60. Brenton.

61. Ottley, *Isaiah*, 1:157 (emphasis added); *NETS*.

62. LXX.D (emphasis original).

in light of Isa 15:1. Like Isa 25:10–12, Isa 15:1 proclaims the destruction of Moabitis, using the same lexeme ἀπόλλυμι (MT דדש). It is clear that the translator's rereading was motivated by a "higher level" interpretation of Isa 25:11 that saw a connection between this passage and Isa 15:1.

#### 25:12

It is interesting to note the translator's use of τοῖχος "wall" for חומה (cf. part 1 ch. 3 in the present study). Why did the translator decide to use τοῖχος here? The reason is found in his interpretation of Isa 25:10–12 as referring to the region known as Μωαβῖτις. This region was located in the southern part of Coele-Syria. Different from τεῖχος, which can refer to either the "wall" of a "city" or a "region," the term τοῖχος can only refer to the "wall of a region, land;" see, for example, Isa 23:13 (and also comments to Isa 25:10). In Isa 25:12, it refers to the collapse of the "walls" of the region known as Μωαβῖτις. Why did the translator not use τεῖχος here as he did in Isa 15:1? It seems that he was trying to avoid confusion between the "wall" of a "city" (Isa 24:23; 26:1) and the "wall" of a "region" (Isa 25:12).

### 6.3. SUMMARY

A careful reading of LXX Isa 25:1–12 points to a coherent text as far as its content is concerned. The text under discussion refers to three different groups. First, the oppressors, which are named "strong cities," "city of the ungodly," "the evil men," the "ungodly men," and the "nations" (Isa 24:2, 4–5), are described as collapsing (25:2) as part of God's "age-old plan" (25:1). Similarly, Isa 25:7–8 urges the Lord (cf. "deliver") to punish the nations and bring his counsel to fruition. Second, the oppressed, referred to with several terms such as "the poor people," "wronged men," "humble city," "fainthearted men," play a role in 25:3–5a, 8. They rejoice by occasion of their oppressors' fall (25:3), expect deliverance from God (25:4)—a deliverance that is portrayed as something that has already started (25:8). The third group is the "we" (25:5, 9–10). This group finds itself in an identical situation of oppression as the second group in 25:3–5a. Isaiah 25:5, 6–7 make clear that they are under the oppression of the "nations," which are occupying Mount Zion. The liberation of the "people" (Isa 25:3–5a, 8) points to the upcoming salvation of the "we" group from oppression in Zion.

In LXX Isa 25:1–12, both "literal" and "free" translations cohere with each other. A case in point is the free "poor people" (ὁ λαὸς ὁ πτωχός) (Isa 25:3 [MT "strong people"]), which coheres with the more lexically literal translation "the people" (λαός) in Isa 25:8. It is also important to note that the free

“poor people” and the literal “people” (Isa 25:3, 8) cohere well with the expression “the inhabitants of the earth will become poor” in Isa 24:6. Moreover, it is worth noticing that several “free” translations come together to create a coherent text. For instance, note that the less literal βουλή (MT plural “counsels”) in Isa 25:1 coheres with the very “free” βουλή in 25:7, even though the content of both “counsels” differ from each other (cf. comments to Isa 25:1–2; 7). Furthermore, the “free” translations with “cities” form a coherent message by way of contrast. The phrase “fortified cities” (Isa 25:2) contrasts with “the cities of ill-treated men” (Isa 25:3) and “every humble city” (Isa 25:4). The “fortified cities” are mentioned again in Isa 26:5. There, they contrast with the “fortified city” of Isa 26:1. Also, the “cities” of Isa 25:2 cohere with the “cities” of Isa 24:10, 12, as noted above. The references to the “evil/ungodly men” (Isa 25:4–5) contrast with the “ill-treated men” (Isa 25:3–4). “In Zion” coheres well with the same expression in Isa 24:23 and with the phrases “on this mountain” in Isa 25:6–7, 10. Finally, the “free” rendition “nations” (Isa 25:6–7) is in keeping with the literal “nations” in Isa 24:13.

The translator also created a coherent text through a careful choice of his lexemes. Note, for example, πόλεις for קריה/עיר in Isa 25:1–5 (cf. also Isa 24:10, 12). Important also is πόλεις ὀχυράς in Isa 25:2 (cf. also Isa 26:5), which contrasts with the πόλεις ὀχυρά in Isa 26:1. For his choice of “ungodly” (Isa 25:2, 5), compare with the “ungodly” in Isa 24:8 and the “ungodly one” in Isa 26:10. Lastly, note the repetition of ἄνθρωπος in Isa 25:3–5, all without clear equivalents in MT. The coherence observed in Isa 25:1–12 points to a “higher level,” unique interpretation of the Hebrew that must have preceded the translation work.

## LXX ISAIAH 26:1–6 IN ITS OWN RIGHT

## 7.1. ISAIAH 26:1–3B: TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

- 21a: In that day they will sing this song in the land of Ioudas  
 1b: saying:  
 1c: “Look, a fortified city, and *as* our salvation he will set a wall and  
 a surrounding wall.  
 2a: Open the gates  
 2b: let a people enter  
 2c: that keeps righteousness  
 2d: and that keeps truth  
 3a: that holds truth fast<sup>1</sup>  
 3b: and that keeps peace.”

## 26:1–3b

26:1a–b introduces a song. The participle λέγοντες “saying,” a plus against MT, makes it clear that the content of the song starts in 26:1c.<sup>2</sup> The change from third person verbs in 26:1c–3b to a direct speech addressed to the Lord in 26:3c–4a clearly demarcates the end of the song at 26:3b. Further, while the references to a “fortified city,” its “walls and surrounding walls,” and its “gates” tie 26:1c–2 together, the fourfold use of participles qualifying λαός (26:2b) unite 26:2–3.<sup>3</sup> The theme surrounding those verses is the entrance of a faithful people into a strong city. As such, 26:1–3b should be taken as a subunit of 26:1–6.

The double accusative σωτήριον ἡμῶν/τείχος καὶ περίτειχος merits further comment. All translations (Brenton, *NETS*, LXX.D.) take the double accusative

1. For this translation, see *GELS*, 59.

2. For a discussion of the translator’s addition of a form of λέγω, see Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA 12/3; Münster: Aschendorffsche, 1934), 58; and, more recently, Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses* (SCS 61; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 58.

3. MT is much less clear in its use of a participle followed by an imperfect in 26:2–3.





In part 1 ch. 4 of this monograph it was indicated that the translator's use of ὀχυρός for יְצָר is unusual. When LXX 26:1–6 is taken in the light of its literary contexts, the reason for the translator's choice becomes clearer. The singular πόλις ὀχυρά stands in sharp contrast with the plural πόλεις ὀχυράς in 25:2; 26:5. It seems that the translator chose ὀχυρός to make the contrast between the establishment of a "fortified city" and the destruction of "fortified cities" clearer.

Furthermore, the translator's use of ὀχυρός indicates he interpreted יְצָר as a "fortified city" instead of a "strong city." In LXX Isaiah, and also elsewhere, the adjective ὀχυρός often qualifies "cities" as "fortified" (cf., e.g., Deut 3:5; 1 Macc 9:50; 2 Macc 12:13, 27; Isa 25:2; 26:5; 30:13; 36:1; 37:26). Contrarily, the phrase πόλις ἰσχυρά "a strong city" occurs rarely in the LXX and elsewhere (Isa 27:3; Dan 11:24; Rev 18:10).

The establishment of a "wall and surrounding wall" is in sharp contrast with the fall of "the wall" in Isa 24:23 (MT: "the glow of the full moon will be ashamed). There, τὸ τεῖχος denotes a "city wall" and it refers to the "wall" of the "fortified cities" of Isa 25:2. It is interesting to note now that the fall of "the wall" in 24:23 contrasts neatly with the reign of the Lord in Zion and Jerusalem. The same idea is found in Isa 26:1–5 where the building of a "wall and surrounding wall" as "salvation" for the "strong city," Jerusalem/Zion, contrasts with the fall of "fortified cities" (26:1, 5).

Isaiah 26:2–3 presents the contents of the song of the "we" group introduced in 26:1 (cf. comments above on the "they" as the "we" group). They welcome a "faithful people" into the "fortified city," namely, Jerusalem/Zion. Part 1 ch. 4 of the present study remarked that the use of λαός for יְגִי is highly unusual in LXX Isaiah. With an interesting style (cf. four participles and the triple use of "to keep"), LXX Isa 26:2–3 introduces a people that "keeps righteousness, truth, and peace." These expressions denote a people that live according to the "law" (cf. the phrase "law[s] of truth" in Neh 9:13; Mal 2:6 and the expression "your law is truth" in Ps 118:142). The λαός entering "Jerusalem/Zion" should be equated with the "godly" of Isa 26:7. This passage refers to the "way of the godly," which is to be taken sapientially as an indication of a people that morally keeps the "law" (cf., e.g., Ps 1).<sup>5</sup> The "people" of Isa 26:2–3 contrasts with the "ungodly" who do not learn "righteousness" or practice the "truth" (Isa 26:10). They further stand in opposition to the "breakers of the law" (Isa 24:14).<sup>6</sup> Because only a "godly people" can enter the

and the Septuagint," in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27*, 194; idem, "Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions," in *As Those Who Are Taught*, 65.

5. van Menxel, *Ελπίς. Espoir. Espérance*, 256–57.

6. Ibid., 256.

city of Jerusalem/Zion, while the “breakers of the law” need to be kept out, the translator found the use of ἔθνος for יגל unfit for the present context.

A further note on the “righteous people” of Isa 26:2 in relation to other groups in Isa 24:1–26:6 is important here. It must be pointed out that the “righteous people” and the “we” group of Isa 25:5, 9–10 are similar. Both groups are portrayed as rejoicing in their salvation (see “our salvation” in 25:9/“as our salvation” in 26:1). Furthermore, “hope” in God characterizes both groups (cf. “in whom we have hoped” in 26:9/“because in you they had hoped” in 26:3–4). However, they must be seen as slightly distinct because, as I argued in the comments to Isa 25:5, the “we” group is already living in Judah, where they are oppressed (Isa 25:4–5). After their liberation (Isa 25:6–10), they welcome a “righteous people” to enter Judah (Isa 26:2). As such, both groups are at the same time distinct from each other in terms of geographical location, while being similar in terms of the religious characteristics that they both share. More research on these two groups will be needed to clarify their identity and relationship. More certain, however, is that the “righteous people” should be taken in opposition to the “poor people” (Isa 24:6c; 25:3, 8). The latter indicates more generally people under oppression without necessarily indicating a “godly people.” Although both benefit from God’s liberating acts, only the “righteous people” are to enter Jerusalem.

The idea that Jerusalem will be delivered and that a “righteous people” will inhabit it finds strong parallels in Isa 60. There, it is said that “salvation” has come to Jerusalem (cf. the references to δόξα κυρίου/יהודה כבוד and τὸ σωτήριον κυρίου/יהודה תהלת Isa 60:1, 6), that her “walls” (τείχος) will be built up (Isa 60:10), and that her “people shall all be righteous” (ὁ λαός σου πᾶς δίκαιος). On the other hand, there is only “darkness” for the “nations” (ἐθνη in 60:2) and dread for “those who humbled” (ταπεινωσάντων in 60:14) Jerusalem. For the Isaiah translator, the same theme is present in Isa 26:1–3, where, according to his interpretation, Jerusalem/Zion is a “safe city” for a “righteous people.”

## 7.2. ISAIAH 26:3C–6 – TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

- 3c: Because in you
- 4a: they forever hoped, O Lord, great, everlasting God,
- 5a: who have humbled
- 5b: and brought low the inhabitants in lofty places,
- 5c: you will throw down fortified cities,
- 5d: and you will bring them down to the ground
- 6a: and the feet of the meek and humble will tread them under.

## 26:3c–6a

A direct address to the “Lord” characterizes this section throughout with the use of second-person pronouns, verbs, and vocatives. The third-person verbs starting in 26:7 indicate the direct address finishes with 26:6a.

The form ἡλπισαν is interesting. First, it represents a different vocalization from MT, which has the imperative בַּטְחוּ. The unvocalized בַּטְחוּ would have given the translator ample opportunity to use an imperative verb—as he tends to do (cf., e.g., Isa 24:11; 25:7).<sup>7</sup> The question must be asked why he decided to use an imperfect instead. Second, the use of ἐλπίζω for בַּטְחוּ is unusual in LXX Isaiah, raising questions about the translator’s lexical choice. And, third, the identity of the subject of ἡλπισαν must also be addressed.

Isaiah 26:4 gives the reason why a “people that keep righteousness” is allowed to enter the city. The reason is found in the clause ὅτι ἐπὶ σοὶ ἡλπισαν κύριε (26:3c–4a), that is to say, besides “keeping righteousness, truth, and peace,” the group of Isa 26:2–3 is also characterized as putting their hope in the Lord.

The use of ἐλπίζω was not the result of a thoughtless decision on the translator’s part. That root plays an important role in LXX Isa 24–26. The theme of trusting in God as the source of deliverance from an oppressive power also appears in LXX Isa 25:9. After God deals with the “nations” that are occupying mount Zion (Isa 25:5, 6–8), the “we” group of Isa 25:5 says: “Look, our God, in whom we trusted (ἐλπίζω/ῆρη) and we rejoiced in our salvation (σωτηρία/ישועה).” In this context, σωτηρία denotes the deliverance from an oppressive power (25:10–12). Ἠλπισαν in Isa 26:4 is in line with the same theme. Because the λαός of Isa 26:2–3 trusted in God (ἐλπίζω/בַּטְחוּ) as the source of their “deliverance,” they were allowed to enter Zion/Jerusalem. Similarly, Isa 24:14 proclaims hope to the “godly one.” The latter has been identified as the person mentioned in Isa 11:1–5.<sup>8</sup>

Interesting is the translator’s use of ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας (cf. part 1 ch. 4 of the present study). A similar phrase appears in Isa 33:22: ὁ γὰρ θεὸς μου μέγας/יהוה אדיר. The context of Isa 33:20 is similar in content to Isa 26:1–6. In Isa 33, Zion/Jerusalem is portrayed as a city of “salvation” (33:20; cf. with 26:1) as a result of the removal of the “lawless” and “ungodly” from Zion (33:14; cf. with comments to Isa 25:6–8). God is described as the one who dwells in “lofty

7. For a discussion of “imperativization” in LXX Isaiah, cf. David A. Baer, *When We All Go Home Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66* (JSOTSup 318; The Hebrew Bible and Its Versions 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 23–52.

8. For a helpful discussion of the “hope” theme in Isa 24–26, see van Menxel, *Ελπίς*, 250–57.

places” and the one who hands the “disobedient” over to judgment (33:2–6; cf. with Isa 25:7). Ultimately, he is the one who saves his people (33:22; cf. with Isa 25:9; 26:1). It seems that the translator’s decision to use the phrase  $\delta$  θεὸς  $\delta$  μέγας had to do with the idea of the Lord as the “great God” who liberates Zion/Jerusalem from the oppressive control of the “ungodly.”

When one looks at the immediate literary context, more can be said about the phrase  $\delta$  θεὸς  $\delta$  μέγας. Although it has been argued that the translator used  $\delta$  μέγας to avoid anthropomorphism (cf. part 1 ch. 4 of the present study), another explanation may be in order. In its present context, the expression “the great God” contrasts with “those who dwell in lofty places” (Isa 26:5). A similar use of the expression is found in Dan 2:45; 9:4, where it contrasts with “powerful rulers.”<sup>9</sup> There may be an aspect of polemics in the translator’s decision to ascribe to the Lord the title of  $\delta$  θεὸς  $\delta$  μέγας in view of the reference to “those who dwell in lofty places.”<sup>10</sup> For the translator, the Lord is the only “great, eternal God” who overthrows foreign powers (26:5).

The phrase  $\delta$ ς ταπεινώσας requires more comments. The relative pronoun  $\delta$ ς (MT: כִּי) links 26:5 with 26:4, making it clear that 26:5 continues the direct speech that started in 26:3c–4a. The relative pronoun  $\delta$ ς further characterizes God as the one who “has humbled and brought low the inhabitants in lofty places.” Isaiah 26:5 raises three important questions: first, the translator’s choice of the root  $\epsilon$ νοικέω (cf. discussion in part 1 ch. 4 of the present study); second, the identity of the  $\epsilon$ νοικοῦντας ἐν ὑψηλοῖς; and third, how to account for the use of past tense verbs in 26:5a–b considering the appearance of future verbs in 26:5c–d. The following will address these issues.

Why did the translator employ the verb  $\epsilon$ νοικέω instead of κατοικέω? The answer must be found in the translator’s interpretive tendency. The translator reserves the verb κατοικέω for when a particular passage refers to God as the one who “dwells in lofty places” (cf. Isa 33:5; 57:15 respectively: ἅγιος  $\delta$  θεὸς  $\delta$  κατοικῶν ἐν ὑψηλοῖς/מְרוֹם כִּי שָׁכַן יְהוָה; κύριος  $\delta$  ὑψιστος  $\delta$  ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν τὸν αἰῶνα/רַם וְנִשָּׂא שָׁכַן עַד). In some places, κατοικέω is also reserved for illegitimate occupiers/settlers (cf. discussion to Isa 24:5, §5.2 in the present study). Contrarily, when a passage has human beings as the ones “dwelling in lofty places,” the translator uses the

9. Cf. also the expressions הַגְּדֹלָה  $\delta$  θεὸς  $\delta$  μέγας in Deut 10:17; Jer 39:18, 19; Dan 9:4 and רַב אֱלֹהִים  $\delta$  θεὸς  $\delta$  μέγας in Dan 2:45. See also LXX Dan 4:37.

10. Interesting also to note is that in the Greek world, some gods were ascribed the title of  $\delta$  θεὸς  $\delta$  μέγας. See ὡς ἔφυς μέγας θεός, Διόνυσσε in Euripides’s *Fragmenta* (August Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1889. Repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1964], frag. 177, line 1) and οἷς θεὸς  $\delta$  μέγας Ὀλύμπιος in Sophocles’s *Electra* (H. Lloyd-Jones and Nigel G. Wilson, *Sophocles fabulae* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1990; repr., 1992], line 209).

verb *ἐνοικέω*, for example, Isa 26:5. Thus, the translator's choice of the verb *ἐνοικέω* in Isa 26:5 is another example of a well-considered translation of the phrase *ישבי מרום*.

The phrase *τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν ὑψηλοῖς* parallels here the “fortified cities” (Isa 26:5). As such, it denotes those who “dwell” in strong places. It carries a connotation of “arrogance, power” that is similar to *ὑψηλοὶ τῆς γῆς* “the high ones of the earth” in Isa 24:4. The phrase *πόλεις ὀχυράς* deserves further discussion. As noted in the “comparison between MT and LXX,” the LXX diverges from MT in two aspects. Whereas MT has the singular “a lofty city” (*קריה נשגבה*), the plural “fortified cities” appears in the LXX. It was also noted that the use of *ὀχυρός* for *נִשְׁגָּב* is atypical in LXX Isaiah (for more on this issue, see discussion on Isa 26:1, above). In the Greek, the contrast between the “city” of 26:1 with the “cities” of 26:5 is much clearer than MT's use of *עיר עז* and *קריה נשגבה* in the same verses. For the translator, Isa 26:1–6 goes over God's establishing a “fortified city,” while bringing down “fortified cities.” Thus, his decision to use the lexemes *πόλις/ὀχυρός* points to a higher-level interpretation of Isa 26:1–5 (cf. discussion to Isa 26:1, above).

Furthermore, the translator decided to use the plural *πόλεις ὀχυράς* due to his understanding that Isa 26:5 shares a similar theme with Isa 25:2. Contrarily, the link between Isa 25:2; 26:1 is less clear in MT, which reads *קריה נשגבה/בצורה* respectively. For the translator, Isa 25:2; 26:1 possess the same theme of the destruction of “fortified cities.”

Additionally, the link between Isa 25:2; 26:5 points to a relationship between the *πόλις ὀχυράς* of Isa 26:5 with the “city of the ungodly” (*τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλις*) of 25:2. As was argued under comments to Isa 25:2 (§6.1), the “city of the ungodly” should be identified with the city of Babylon. In the same way, the plural “fortified cities” in 26:5, as also in 25:2, should be seen as references to important “cities” of the Babylonian empire. The question as to whether Babylon was used as a cipher for the Seleucids in the translator's day cannot be addressed here. It suffices to say that the translator's careful choice of certain lexemes to form a coherent text highly suggests that his translation work was preceded by a careful interpretation of the Hebrew on a higher level.

### 7.3. SUMMARY

In sum, LXX Isa 26:1–6 represents a coherent composition that goes over two interrelated but contrasting ideas. On the one hand, God will establish a “fortified city” that will function as a source of deliverance for a “righteous people.” On the other hand, God will also destroy “fortified cities,” which will signal the destruction of the “ungodly's” kingdom. In light of the discussion of Isa 25:2 (§6.1), this kingdom should be identified with Babylon. The transla-

tor produced this coherence by choosing the same lexemes (πόλεις/ὄχυρός) in 25:2; 26:1; 5. In contrast, the coherence of MT is less clear because of the use of different lexemes.

Moreover, Isa 26:1–6 introduces at least two different and yet similar groups. There is the “they” in Isa 26:1, which must be identified with the “we” group. After their liberation from oppression in Zion, the “we” group welcomes a “people that keeps righteousness” into the “fortified city.” This “righteous people” must be taken as the “godly” in Isa 26:7. Their attitude is in conformity with the “law” in contrast with the “ungodly,” who “break the law” (Isa 24:16). The “righteous people” and the “we” group share the same religious characteristics in that both rejoice in their “salvation” (Isa 25:9; 26:1) and both are described as trusting in God (Isa 25:9; 26:3–4). While there is “salvation” for the “we” group and the “righteous people,” there is judgment for the “fortified cities” (Isa 26:5). Such a coherent composition can only be the result of a particular interpretation that must have been well constructed before the translation started.

## CONCLUSIONS

The present work has analyzed LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 in two distinct but inter-related steps. Part 1 compared the text under discussion with MT and discussed several divergent readings found in the LXX. More narrowly, part 1 raised questions concerning the translator's lexical choices in several verses. Part 2, on the other hand, took LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 as a text in its own right, arguing that the Greek version can be seen as a coherent text, a coherence that becomes clear through the translator's lexical choices, among other aspects (e.g., the translator's use of conjunctions as in Isa 24:14). It was further argued that both "literal" and "free" renderings come together to form a coherent ideological text that, in its final form, differs greatly from MT. What follows is a summary of the main content(s) of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6.

Contrary to MT, the LXX betrays a heightened concern with the theme of "cities." In fact, this theme lends coherence to Isa 24:1–26:6. Whereas MT Isa 24:10, 12 refer to one specific city ("the city of nothingness" and "in the city" respectively), LXX mentions "cities." Additionally, it translates two different lexemes in MT (עיר/קריה) with the same Greek word: πόλις. A similar approach is found in the LXX's handling of Isa 25:2. Whereas MT refers to "city," "town," and "citadel" (עיר, קריה, and ארמון), the Greek has "cities," "fortified cities," and "the city of the ungodly" (πόλεις, πόλεις ὀχυράς, and τῶν ἀσεβῶν πόλις). Moreover, while MT Isa 25:3 mentions "the city of violent nations," "the cities of wronged men" is found in the LXX. Interestingly, LXX Isa 25:4 brings up "every humble city" even though "city(ies)" is not mentioned in MT Isa 25:4. In its own context, the "humble cities" of Isa 25:4 parallel the "cities of wronged men" in Isa 25:3. Moving on further, while both MT and LXX Isa 26:1 speak of a "fortified city," in Isa 26:5 one finds another divergence. Whereas MT has "high city" (קריה נשגבה), the LXX cites "fortified cities" (πόλεις ὀχυράς). The translator's choice of πόλεις ὀχυράς was clearly motivated by his will to create a contrast between the "fortified city" of 26:1 and the "fortified cities" of 26:5. Furthermore, "fortified cities" appears also in Isa 25:2. Ultimately, LXX communicates the message that, whereas God



brings down “cities,” “fortified cities,” and the “city of the ungodly” (Isa 24:10, 12; 25:2; 26:5), he liberates the “cities of wronged men” and becomes a help “to every humble city” (Isa 25:3–4), at the same time as he establishes a “fortified city” (Isa 26:1). The theme of “cities,” therefore, brings Isa 24:1–26:6 together.

Another thematic difference between LXX and MT concerns distinct groups found in the Greek version. In LXX Isa 24 (see ch. 5 in the present study), the Lord’s destruction of the *οἰκουμένη* “world” (Isa 24:1) means both judgment and salvation. It is judgment for the group of the “ungodly” (Isa 24:8 [MT “jubilant”]). This group is associated with “breaking/rejecting the law” (Isa 24:5, 16) and “changing the ordinances” (Isa 24:5) and is the main reason for the “earth’s” “lawless” behavior (Isa 24:5, 20). Other terms for this group are “the high ones of the earth” (Isa 24:4 [= MT]), the “nations” (Isa 24:13 [= MT]), the “rejecters of the law” (Isa 24:16 [absent from MT]), and the “kings of the earth” (Isa 24:21 [= MT]). They are to be seen as a group that holds control over the *οἰκουμένη* (24:1) and as powerful and rich (Isa 24:8). Because of their “lawlessness,” they are to receive judgment (Isa 24:13, 20–23). Their judgment means salvation for two distinct groups. First, there is the group referred to as “poor” (Isa 24:6 [= MT]), a group that figures prominently in LXX Isa 25 (cf. below). And, second, there is the group called the “remnant” (Isa 24:6, 14 [absent from MT]). In view of the “ungodly’s” destruction, those who remain after God’s destruction of the “world” rejoice in God’s salvation (Isa 24:14–15).

The theme of judgment for the “ungodly” and salvation for the “poor” continues in LXX Isa 25 (cf. ch. 6 in the present study). The “ungodly” are portrayed there as the oppressors, being referred to with terms such as “the evil/ungodly men” (Isa 25:4–5 [MT “heavy rain,” “aliens”]) and the “nations” (Isa 25:6–7). They are associated with a powerful city, the “city of the ungodly” (Isa 25:2 [MT “the citadel of aliens”]). This city and other “fortified cities” are described as collapsing, picking up the theme of the “wall’s” collapse introduced in Isa 24:23 (MT “sun”). The destruction of the “city of the ungodly” (Isa 25:2) means “salvation” for the oppressed. This group is further denoted as “the poor people” (Isa 25:3 [MT “the strong people”], “the wronged men” (Isa 25:3–4 [MT “violent people”/“violent”]), “those who are despondent on account of poverty” (Isa 25:4 [MT “the poor”]), “faint-hearted men” (Isa 25:5 [MT “like the rain against the wall”]) and the “people” (Isa 25:8 [MT “his people”]). LXX Isaiah’s stress on the “poor people” picks up the theme of the “poor” introduced in Isa 24:6. The oppressed are associated with “cities” and “every humble city” (Isa 25:3, 4 [MT “refuge”]). Their liberation functions as a sign for the salvation of another group, namely, the “we” (Isa 25:5 [MT unclear]). This group is under oppression in “Zion” (Isa 25:5 [MT “waterless land”]) resonating with the theme of Zion in Isa 24:23 (= MT). They rejoice in



“our salvation” (Isa 25:9 [MT “his salvation”]) and put their hope in God (Isa 25:9 [= MT]). The theme of “hope” appeared already in Isa 24:16 and it will figure again in Isa 26:4. The fall of the “natural wall” of Moabitis (Isa 25:10–12) also points to a “rest” that God will give to the “we” group.

The theme of judgment/salvation continues in LXX Isa 26:1–6 (cf. ch. 7 in the present study). The collapse of “fortified cities” (Isa 26:5 [MT “high city”]; cf. Isa 24:10, 12; 25:2) contrasts with the “fortified city” (Isa 26:1 [MT “fortified city”]) that functions as “our salvation” (Isa 26:1; different syntactical reading from MT). The “our” in “our salvation” indicates that Isa 26:1 speaks of the liberated “we” group in Zion. They welcome a “people that keeps righteousness, truth, and peace” (Isa 26:2–3) into the “fortified city.” The “people” of Isa 26:2–3 should be identified with the “godly” of Isa 26:7. Like the “we” group, they are also characterized as “hoping” in the Lord (Isa 26:4 [MT “trust”]). The “people that keeps righteousness” and the “we” group are at the same time distinct and similar. They are similar because they share two important religious characteristics: they rejoice in “their salvation” (Isa 25:9; 26:1) and they hope in God (Isa 25:9; 26:3–4). They are distinct in geographical terms. While the “we” group is already in Judah where they suffer oppression (Isa 25:5), the “righteous people” are welcomed in Judah (Isa 26:2) by the “we” group. Further, the “righteous people” of Isa 26:2–3 are not the same as the “poor people” group of Isa 24:6c; 25:3–5a, 8; the latter designates people who will profit from the fall of the oppressive “city of the ungodly” in general terms, while the former are welcomed inside the “fortified city” of Isa 26:1 on account of their “righteous” behavior. Overall, unlike MT, LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 proclaim judgment for the “ungodly” and salvation for the “poor,” the “godly one,” the “remnant,” a “righteous” people, and the “we” group under oppression in Zion.

Finally, the relationship between the themes of “city(ies)” and the “ungodly/godly” needs to be addressed. The clearest example of the relation between “city” and “ungodly” is Isa 25:2: “the city of the ungodly.” However, the “cities” of Isa 24:10, 12 are also to be connected with the “ungodly” of Isa 24:8. Both are portrayed as receiving judgment. As the “ungodly’s” “arrogance and wealth” cease, so are their “cities” destroyed. The “cities” of Isa 25:2 may also be related to the “city of the ungodly.” It is possible that they are minor “cities” that together composed the “ungodly’s” empire, represented by its main city, “the city of the ungodly.” If so, the “fortified cities” of Isa 26:5 are to be related with the “ungodly” of Isa 25:2 because the latter also mentions “fortified cities.” As such, LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 link the fall of “city(ies)” (Isa 24:10, 12; 25:2; 26:5) with the judgment of the “ungodly” (Isa 24:8; 25:2). In contrast, the “fortified city” of Isa 26:1 is connected with a “righteous people” (Isa 26:2–3) and with the “we” group of Isa 25:5. Finally, the “cities of wronged

men” and “every humble city” of Isa 25:3–4 are related to a general group of people that will be liberated from the oppression of the “ungodly.”

The coherence of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 points to a “higher level” interpretation of the Hebrew. This “higher level” reading can be characterized as a very particular way of interpreting Isa 24:1–26:6, as the comments above show. Such a reading could only have been the result of a unique way of reading Isaiah that preceded the process of translation. It does not mean that the translator already knew which word he was going to use for which Hebrew term. Rather, it means that the translator had particular themes in mind that were reflected in his lexical and conjunction choices. If the translator already had an interpretation in mind before he started translating Isaiah, it stands to reason to say a few words on the most fitting methodology for a study of LXX Isaiah.

### 8.1. A WORD ON METHODOLOGY

The present study has revealed that LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 should be seen as a coherent text. The final shape of the Greek translation of those verses points to a “higher level” interpretation behind the process of translating Hebrew Isa 24:1–26:6, which has an important implication for a methodological approach to LXX Isaiah. Part 1 of the present work has shown that many scholars have explained several divergences between MT and LXX as due to a different *Vorlage*, mistakes, errors in the transmission of the LXX, and so on. Most approaches to LXX Isaiah stop on the level of comparing MT and LXX on a word-for-word analysis, hardly paying attention to the LXX as a text in its own right. Seen from the word-for-word level, many divergences look like mistakes or due to a different source text. However, the present work advocates that a more fitting approach to LXX Isaiah is to take it as a text in its own right before one can offer explanations for differences in the LXX.

To cite here only a few cases discussed in the introduction, Scholz argued that the readings “they were ashamed” (Isa 24:9; MT “in song”) and “poor people” (Isa 25:3; MT “strong people”) point to a different *Vorlage* from MT (cf. discussion in §1.1.1 of the present work). Besides lacking textual support, such a claim was pronounced without inquiring whether those readings make sense in their respective literary contexts. The present work has demonstrated that both cohere with other aspects of Isa 24:1–26:6. The reading in Isa 24:9 expresses the shame of the “ungodly” (24:8) after their arrogance and wealth passed way. Likewise, “poor people” (Isa 25:3) is linked to the theme of the oppressed in Isa 24:6; 25:3–5a. As such, the divergent readings in Isa 24:9; 25:3 find their cause in a particular way of interpreting the Hebrew (cf. comments to Isa 24:9 [§5.3]; 25:3 [§6.1]) rather than pointing to a different source text from MT.

Likewise, Ottley claimed that the reading “the wall will fall” in Isa 24:23 (MT “the sun will be ashamed”) was a mistake (cf. discussion in §1.1.2 of the present study). However, an analysis of the Greek text as a product has revealed that the reading in the LXX coheres well with the theme of the fall of “cities/strong cities/the city of the ungodly” (Isa 24:10, 12; 25:2; 26:5). Rather than being a mistake, it originated with a unique way of reading the Hebrew.

The study of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 as a product has indicated that several divergences are the result of the translator’s unique interpretation of his *Vorlage*. This implies that explanations for divergences in the Greek must be carried out only after the Greek as a text in its own right has been carefully analyzed. The question must be whether the Greek has any coherence in terms of its contents. If it does, then it is unlikely that its variant readings were accidental.

## 8.2. FURTHER RESEARCH

### 8.2.1. LXX Isaiah’s translation process

The present work has occasionally explained how the translator arrived at a particular reading. A systematic treatment, however, is still needed. Further research should focus on the question as to how the analysis of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6 in its own right sheds light on the process of the translation. Scholars have offered at least four main explanations for the LXX’s departure from the Hebrew: a different *Vorlage* (Scholz and Troxel, although the latter to a much lesser degree), mechanical error in the process of the translation (Ottley), the translator’s ideology (Seeligmann, das Neves, Koenig, and van der Kooij), and, most recently, stylistics (van der Vorm-Croughs). I have argued that an important question is whether the presence or lack of coherence can help in clarifying how the translator arrived at a particular reading. Against the too-often claims that the translator made a mistake, this work has argued at certain points that an analysis of LXX Isa 24:1–26:6’s final product betrays rather a particular interpretation of the Hebrew. A more systematic treatment is left for future research.

### 8.2.2. LXX Isaiah’s Hermeneutics and Historical Background

Recent studies (e.g., Troxel; see §1.1.3 in the present study) on the LXX of Isaiah have started to question the thesis that the translator actualized some prophecies in Hebrew Isaiah in the light of his own historical circumstances. A weakness of those studies lies in their atomistic approach to LXX Isaiah, focusing on words or phrases without paying careful consideration to the

translation's final product. It is left for future research to discuss whether LXX Isaiah reflects a "fulfillment-interpretation" hermeneutic. This monograph is a plea that such a discussion be carried out only after a passage in LXX Isaiah—and a passage in the light of others in the same book—has been carefully studied to see if it has any coherence of its own. If it does, it stands to reason to ask whether that particular coherent message has a link with the translator's historical background.<sup>1</sup>

In relation to Isa 24:1–26:6, a few points need to be researched further. The first is whether *οἰκουμένη* "denotes the historical background of the smaller and larger Hellenistic states" as Seeligmann argued.<sup>2</sup> Second, in connection with *οἰκουμένη*, there need to be future studies to assess whether the "cities" (Isa 24:10, 12; 25:2, 4; 26:1, 5) also have a link with the translator's time. For instance, could the "city of the ungodly" (Babylon) (Isa 25:2) and the collapsing "cities" (Isa 24:10, 12; 25:3) be seen as a cipher for the Seleucid empire? More research on their identity throughout the book is needed. Third, the translation's reference to the region of Moabitis's fall is intriguing. It would be important to see whether that reference has any foundation in the translator's time. And, fourth, the identity of the different "groups" (cf. summary above) needs to be explored further in other Isaianic passages. Who is the "we" group under oppression in Zion (Isa 25:5)? Who are the "righteous people" allowed to enter Jerusalem (Isa 26:2–3)? These and other questions beg for future research on the historical background of the translation.

### 8.2.3. The Identity of the Translator

It has been argued that the translator of Isaiah was a competent scribe, who was well acquainted with the book of Isaiah (cf. review of van der Kooij in §1.1.3 of the present study). The present work has, by and large, offered further support for that view. It has demonstrated that the translator had an encompassing knowledge of Hebrew Isa 24:1–26:6 but also a particular interpretation in mind before he translated it either as a whole or in parts. As such, more research is needed on other chapters of Isaiah to either confirm or disprove viewing the translator as a scribe.

In sum, generally, the translator's interpretation tends to be at odds with modern interpretations of MT. Consequently, some accuse the translator of

---

1. Cameron Boyd-Taylor, review of Anneli Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, BIOSCS 42 (2009): 126: "The translator and his text ought to be situated (to the extent possible) in a specific social and cultural environment."

2. Isaac Leo Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (MVEOL 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948), 81.

being at fault. However, it is important to realize that the translator had a very particular mode of reading his source text. As one scholar put it well:

One should, however, keep in mind that with all types of exegesis the translators had one prevailing intention, namely, to transmit the message of the Bible to their readers, and even if, according to our understanding, the translators seem to be a long way from the simple meaning of the Bible, they were, nevertheless, reflecting what the translators considered to be the basic message of the Bible.<sup>3</sup>

---

3. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 125.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aejmelaesus, Anneli. "Levels of Interpretation: Tracing the Trail of the Septuagint Translators." Pages 295–312 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Rev. and expanded ed. CBET 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- . "What We Talk about When We Talk about Translation Technique." Pages 205–22 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Rev. and expanded ed. CBET 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Baer, David A. Review of Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. VT 60 (2010): 302.
- . *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah* 56–66. JSOTSup 318. The Hebrew Bible and Its Versions 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Barr, James. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. MSU 15. NAWG 11. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Barthélemy, Dominique. *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. 4 vols. OBO 50. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982–2005.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 1–39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 19. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Bosman, Hendrick J. and Harm W. M. van Grol. "Annotated Translation of Isaiah 24–27." Pages 3–12 in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27: The Isaiah Workshop–De Jesaja Werkplaats*. Edited by Hendrik Jan Bosman and Harm W. M. van Grol. OtSt 43. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron. Review of Anneli Aejmelaesus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. BIOSCS 42 (2009): 122–27.
- Brenton, Lancelot Charles Lee. *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament: With an English Translation and with Various Readings and Critical Notes*. London: Bagster & Sons, 1870.
- Brockington, Leonard H. "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in ΔΟΞΑ." VT 1 (1951): 23–32.

- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1907.
- Burrows, Millar. "Orthography, Morphology, and Syntax of the St. Mark's Isaiah Manuscript." *JBL* 68 (1949): 195–211.
- Casevitz, Michel. *Le vocabulaire de la colonisation en grec ancien. Étude lexicologique: les familles de κτίζω et de οἰκέω-οἰκίζω*. Études et Commentaires 97. Paris: Klincksieck, 1985.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Chilton, Bruce D. *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes*. ArBib 11. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1987.
- Conybeare, F. C. and St. George Stock. *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek*. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1905.
- Coste, Jean M. "Le Texte Grec d'Isaïe XXV, 1–5." *RB* 61 (1954): 36–66.
- Crom, Dries de. "The LXX Text of Canticles: A Descriptive Study in Hebrew-Greek Translation." PhD diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven OE Literatuurwetenschap: Tekst en Interpretatie, 2009.
- Cunha, Wilson de Angelo. "A Brief Discussion of MT Isaiah 24,14–16." *Bib* 90 (2009): 530–44.
- Doyle, Brian. *The Apocalypse of Isaiah Metaphorically Speaking: A Study of the Use, Function and Significance of Metaphors in Isaiah 24–27*. BETL 151. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Eklblad, Eugene R., Jr. *Isaiah's Servant Poems according to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study*. CBET 23. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- Euler, Karl F. *Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jes 53 in der Griechischen Bibel*. BWANT 66. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934.
- Fischer, Johann. *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaïas den LXX vor?* BZAW 56. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930.
- Fritsch, Charles T. "The Concept of God in the Greek Translation of Isaiah." Pages 155–69 in *Biblical Studies in Memory of H. C. Alleman*. Edited by Jacob M. Myers, Otto Reimherr, and Howard N. Bream. New York: Augustin, 1960.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A. E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
- Gray, George B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah 1–27*. ICC 18. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912.
- Hanhart, Robert. *Studien zur Septuaginta und zum hellenistischen Judentum*. Edited by Reinhard G. Kratz. FAT 24. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and*



- the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1897. Suppl., 1906. Reprint, 3 vols. in 2. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987.
- Hibbard, Todd J. *Intertextuality in Isaiah 24–27: The Reuse and Evocation of Earlier Texts and Traditions*. FAT 2/16. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Hieke, Thomas. “‘Er verschlingt den Tod für immer’ (Jes 25,8a): Eine unerfüllte Verheißung im Alten und Neuen Testament.” *BZ* 50 (2006): 31–50.
- Jastrow, Marcus. *Dictionary of Targumim, Talmud and Midrashic Literature*. New York: Judaica, 1985.
- Joüon, Paul. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd ed. 2nd repr. Trans. and rev. Takamitsu Muraoka. SubBi 27. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2009.
- Jobes, Karen H. and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.
- Katz, Peter. “Notes on the Septuagint.” *JTS* 47 (1946): 30–33.
- Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Brill: Leiden, 1994–2000.
- Koenig, Jean. *L’herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d’après les témoins textuels d’Isaïe*. VTSup 33. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- Kooij, Arie van der. *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments*. OBO 35. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- . “The Cities of Isaiah 24–27 according to the Vulgate, Targum and the Septuagint.” Pages 183–98 in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27: The Isaiah Workshop–De Jesaja Werkplaats*. Edited by Hendrik Jan Bosman and Harm W. M. van Grol. *OtSt* 43. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . “Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions.” Pages 49–68 in “*As Those Who Are Taught*”: *The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. Edited by Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull. *SBLSymS* 27. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- . “Isaiah 24–27: Text-Critical Notes.” Pages 13–15 in *Studies in Isaiah 24–27: The Isaiah Workshop–De Jesaja Werkplaats*. Edited by Hendrik Jan Bosman and Harm W. M. van Grol. *OtSt* 43. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

- . “LXX-Isaiah 8:9 and the Issue of Fulfilment-Interpretation.” *Adamantius* 13 (2007): 20–28.
- . “The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16–25: Translation and Interpretation.” Pages 127–66 in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. SBLSCS 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- . “The Old Greek of Isaiah and Other Prophecies Published in Ptolemaic Egypt.” Pages 72–84 in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse. 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.–27.7.2008*. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer. WUNT 1/252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- . *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision*. VTSup 71. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . “Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint: Who Are the Translators?” Pages 214–29 in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Edited by Edward Noort, Florentino García Martínez, and Adam Simon van der Woude. VTSup 73. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . “Rejoice, O Thirsty Desert! (Isaiah 35): On Zion in the Septuagint of Isaiah.” Pages 11–20 in *‘Enlarge the Site of Your Tent’: The City as Unifying Theme in Isaiah; The Isaiah Workshop—De Jesaja Werkplaats*. Edited by Archibald L. H. M. van Wieringen and Annemarieke van der Woude. OtSt 58. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- . Review of Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: the Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. BIOSCS 42 (2009): 147–52.
- . “The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Issue of Coherence: A Twofold Analysis of LXX Isaiah 31:9b–32:8.” Pages 33–48 in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives; Papers Read at the Conference on the Septuagint of Isaiah, Held in Leiden 10–11 April 2008*. Edited by Arie van der Kooij and Michäel N. van der Meer. CBET 55. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- . “The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Mode of Reading Prophecies in Early Judaism.” Pages 597–611 in *Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Julie 2006*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. WUNT 1/219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

- . “Die Septuaginta Jesajas als Dokument Jüdischer Exegese.—Einige Notizen zu LXX–Jes. 7.” Pages 91–102 in *Übersetzung und Deutung: Studien zu dem Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt* A.R. Hulst gewidmet von Freunden und Kollegen. Nijkerk: Callenbach: 1977.
- . “The Text of Isaiah and Its Early Witnesses in Hebrew.” Pages 143–52 in *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker Offered by the Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta*. Edited by Yohanan Goldman, Arie van der Kooij, and Richard D. Weiss. VTSup 110. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . “Wie heißt der Messias?” Zu Jes 9,5 in den alten griechischen Versionen.” Pages 156–69 in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik; Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, and Christoph Levin. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.
- . “Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta.” Pages 9–25 in *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik*. Edited by Henning Graf Reventlow. VWGTh 11. Gütersloh: Kaiser/Gütersloher, 1997.
- Kutscher, Edward Y. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1 Q Isaa)*. STDJ 6. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Le Moigne, Phillippe. *Le livre d’Ésaïe dans la Septante: ecdotique, stylistique, linguistique ou Esquisse d’une poétique de la Septante*. PhD diss., Paris: École Pratique des Hautes Études, 2001.
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with rev. suppl. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Liebmann, Ernst. “Der Text zu Jesaja 24–27.” ZAW 22 (1902): 1–56; 23 (1903): 209–86; 24 (1904): 51–104; 25 (1905): 145–71.
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh and Nigel G. Wilson. *Sophoclis fabulae*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.
- Louw, Theo A. W. van der. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. CBET 47. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Lust, Johan, Eric Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. 2nd rev. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.
- Meer, Michaël N. van der. “Papyrological Perspectives on the Septuagint of Isaiah.” Pages 107–33 in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives; Papers Read at the Conference on the Septuagint of Isaiah, Held in Leiden 10–11 April 2008*. Edited by Arie van der Kooij and Michaël N. van der Meer. CBET 55. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.

- . “Trendy Translations in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Study of the Vocabulary of the Greek Isaiah 3,18–23 in the Light of Contemporary Sources.” Pages 581–96 in *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*. Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. WUNT 1/219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- . “Visions from Memphis and Leontopolis: The Phenomenon of the Vision Reports in the Greek Isaiah in the Light of Contemporary Accounts from Hellenistic Egypt.” Pages 281–316 in *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Michaël N. van der Meer, Percy van Keulen, Wido van Peursen, and Bas ter Haar Romeny. VTSup138. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Menxel, François van. Ελπίς. *Espoir. Espérance. Etudes sémantiques et théologiques du vocabulaire de l'espérance dans l'Hellénisme et le Judaïsme avant le Nouveau Testament*. Publications Universitaires Européennes: Théologie 23/213. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1983.
- Moulton, James Hope and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1949.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. “The Community Rule (1QS): Column 4.” Pages 335–46 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- . *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint*. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- Nauck, August. *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1889. Repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1964.
- Neves, J. C. M. das. *A Teologia da Tradução Grega dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías (Cap. 24 de Isaías)*. Lisbon: Universidade Católica Portuguesa, 1973.
- . “A Teologia dos Setenta no Livro de Isaías.” *Itinerarium* 43 (1964): 1–33.
- . “Isaías 7,14 no Texto Massorético e no Texto Grego: A obra de Joachim Becker.” *Did* 2 (1972): 79–112.
- Ngunga, Abi T. *Messianism in the Old Greek of Isaiah: An Intertextual Analysis*. FRLANT 245. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

- Olley, John W. *'Righteousness' in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Contextual Study*. SBLSCS 8. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1–39*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Ottley, Richard R. *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)*. 2 vols. London: Clay & Sons, 1904–1906.
- Parry, Donald W. and Elisha Qimron. *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaa): A New Edition*. STDJ 32. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Parry, Donald W. and Emanuel Tov, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2004–2005.
- Payne Smith, Jessie. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. ALR. London: Clarendon, 1896. Repr., Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 1999.
- Pietersma, Albert. "A Panel Presentation on Ronald Troxel's LXX-Isaiah:" 1–18. Online: [http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/Troxel'sLXX-Isaiah\(2008\).pdf](http://homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~pietersm/Troxel'sLXX-Isaiah(2008).pdf).
- Porter, Stanley E. and Brook W. R. Pearson. "Isaiah through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah." Pages 531–46 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. VTSup 70/2. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Preisigke, Friedrich, Emil Kiessling, Hans-Albert Rupprecht, and Andrea Jördens. *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden Mit Einschluss der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienschilder usw. aus Ägypten*. Berlin: Erben, 1925.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta: is est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
- . "Über Theodotion-Lesarten im Neuen Testament und Aquila-Lesarten bei Justin." *ZNW* 20 (1921): 182–99.
- Raurell, Frederic. "'Archontes' en la Interpretació Midràshica d'Is-LXX." *RCT* 1 (1976): 315–74.
- . "LXX-IS 26: La 'Doxa' Com a Participació en La Vida Escatològica." *RCT* 7 (1982): 57–89.
- . "Matisos Septuagíntico-Isaítics en l'Ús Neotestamentari de 'Doxa'." *EstFr* 84 (1983): 297–314.
- . "La teologia de Js-LXX en un studio reciente." *EstFr* 76 (1975): 409–21.
- Rudolph, Wilhelm., *Jesaja 24–27*. BWANT 62. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933.
- Schaper, Joachim L. W. Review of Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. *JSOT* 33 (2009): 57–58.

- Scholl, Reinhard. *Die Elenden in Gottes Thronrat: Stilistisch-kompositorische Untersuchungen zu Jesaja 24–27*. BZAW 274. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000.
- Scholz, Anton. *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Jesaias*. Würzburg: Woerl, 1880.
- Seeligmann, Isac Leo. “Problemen en perspectieven in het moderne Septuaginta-Onderzoek.” *JEOL* 7 (1940): 359–90e. English translation: “Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research.” *Text* 15 (1990): 169–232.
- . *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems*. MVEOL 9. Leiden: Brill, 1948. Repr. pages 119–294 Isac L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognates Studies*. Edited by Robert Hanhart and Hermann Spieckermann. FAT 40. Tübingen: Mohr 2004.
- Sheppard, H. W. “ΤΟΥ ΣΙΑΩΑΜ - הַשְׁלֹחַ Isa. viii 6.” *JTS* 16 (1915): 414–16.
- Smyth, Herbert W. *Greek Grammar for Colleges*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.
- Sokoloff, Michael. *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann’s Lexicon Syriacum*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009.
- Sperber, Alexander. *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Spicq, Ceslas. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. Translated and edited by James D. Ernest. 3 vols. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Swete, Henry B. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902. Repr. Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2003.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. “Amen as an Introductory Oath Formula.” *Text* 7 (1969): 124–29.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. “Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX.” *JTS* 9 (1908): 597–601.
- Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies—and Beyond*. BTL 4. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1995.
- Tov, Emanuel. “Personal Names in the Septuagint of Isaiah.” Pages 413–28 in *Isaiah in Context: Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Michaël N. van der Meer, Percy van Keulen, Wido van Peursen, and Bas ter Haar Romeny. VTSup 138. Leiden: Brill, 2010.



- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Troxel, Ronald L. "ΒΟΥΛΗ and ΒΟΥΛΕΥΕΙΝ in LXX Isaiah." Pages 153–71 in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives; Papers Read at the Conference on the Septuagint of Isaiah, Held in Leiden 10-11 April 2008*. Edited by Arie van der Kooij and Michäel N. van der Meer. CBET 55. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- . "Economic Plunder as a Leitmotif in LXX-Isaiah." *Bib* 83 (2002): 375–91.
- . *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. SJSJ 124. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Ulrich, Eugene. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. VTSup 134. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Vaccari, Alberto. "Parole Rovesciate e Critiche Errate nella Bibbia Ebraica." Pages 553–66 in *Studi Orientalistici in Onore di Giorgio Levi Della Vida*. Edited by Raffaele Ciasca. 2 vols. Pubblicazioni Dell'Istituto Per L'Oriente 54. Roma: Istituto Per L'Oriente, 1956.
- . "ΠΟΛΙΣ ΑΣΕΔΕΚ IS. 19, 18." *Bib* 2 (1921): 353–56.
- Vorm-Croughs, Mirjam van der. *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Pluses and Minuses*. SBLSCS 61. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.
- Waard, Jan de. "'Homophony' in the Septuagint." *Bib* 62 (1981): 551–61.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and Michael O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Wevers, John Williams. *LXX: Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. SBLSCS 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Wildberger, Hans. *Jesaja*. BKAT 10/2. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978.
- Williams, Ronald J. *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *Isaias*. 3rd ed. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
- . *Der Jesajakommentar*. Eusebius Werke: Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Berlin: Akademie, 1975.
- . *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*. ATA 12/3. Münster: Aschendorffsche, 1934.
- Zillessen, Alfred. "Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40–66)." *ZAW* 22 (1902): 238–63.





## INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

HEBREW BIBLE/OLD TESTAMENT		Leviticus	
		5:4	60
Genesis		19:37	130
2:1	81, 153	26:32	53
6:11	126	26:46	59, 130
7:11	77		
8:2	77	Numbers	
11	30	1:10	78
11:3–4	23	5:19	57
11:8	62	5:22	88
31:27	62	16:29	83
41:14	82	21:4	168
41:35	57	22:34	78
45:6	69	23:25	77
48:16	69	31:9	55
49:3	133	31:32	55
		31:53	55
Exodus		35:33	58
7:16	69		
8:18	69	Deuteronomy	
9:29	62	2:35	55
9:34	62	3:5	183
10:15	126	3:7	55
15:7	71	4:5	69
15:11	146, 149	4:19	81, 153
15:20	62	4:37	58
17:6	4	10:17	114, 186
18:16	59, 130	11:32	59
18:20	59, 130	12:1	59
19:16	110	15:6	126
31:17	62	15:8	126
32:34	81	15:10	126
34:7	81	17:3	81, 153
		20:14	55
		27:15–26	88

<i>Deuteronomy (cont.)</i>		18:6	62
28:12	126	23:10	74, 146
28:20	165	23:11	74, 146
28:57	165	30:25	59
29:15	139		
31:9	114	2 Samuel	
32:2	114	6:5	62
32:5	114	19:20	53
32:15	114		
32:18	114	1 Kings	
32:30	114	1:36	88
32:31	114	3:7	86
32:37	114	5:25	69
32:26	62	8:23	74, 146
32:43	71, 142	8:25	74, 146
		8:26	74
Joshua		8:28	74
3:5	86	8:58	59
3:17	110	8:61	59
4:1	110	9:4	59
8:2	55	17:21	86
8:27	55		
11:14	55	2 Kings	
24:15	78	7:2	77
		7:19	77
Judges		17:9	112
8:4	168	18:5	113
9:26	113	18:8	112
10:16	168	18:13–20:19	166
11:34	62	18:24	113
11:39	59	19:15	74, 146
16:16	168	19:26	53
20:36	113	22:16	53
21:3	74, 146	22:19	53
Ruth		1 Chronicles	
2:16	77	5:20	113
		13:8	62
1 Samuel		15:21	100
1:3	97	16:17–18	59
1:11	97	16:33	71
10:5	62	22:13	59
14:41	74, 146	29:10	74, 146
15:2	97	29:19	59
17:45	97		

2 Chronicles		7:2	86
6:14	74, 146	7:4	86
6:16	74, 146	7:7	86
6:17	74, 146	9:11	113
6:37	53	10:4	59
7:17	59	12:2	110
19:9	87	12:4	86
19:10	60	13:6	113
31:21	130	14:2	130
33:8	59, 130	17:15	139
34:31	59	17:29	86
35:25	59	18:2	114
36:23	122	18:15	77
		21:8	113
Ezra		22:5	113
1:2	122	22:6	113
7:10	59, 130	26:1	113
7:11	59	27:3	113
9:15	74, 146	27:12	96, 169
		28:7	113
Nehemiah		29:3	86
1:7	59	29:13	86
9:13	59, 130, 183	31:3	114
9:14	59, 130	31:7	113
		31:15	113
Esther		31:24	110
1:20	60	32:10	113
3:13b	122	33:21	113
		34:24	86
Job		36:6	87
6:23	92	37:3	113
15:20	92	37:5	113
21:12	142	37:6	4
24:4	117	37:16	86
24:23	113	37:22	86
26:10	59	39:6	86
27:13	92	40:4	113
30:3	165	40:11	87
42:3	86	41:2	114
		41:3	96, 169
Psalms		41:10	113
1	183	41:14	88
2:7	59	44:7	113
3:6	111	45:7	80
4:6	113	52:9	94

<i>Psalms (cont.)</i>		94:20	59
52:10	113	96:13	87
54:5	92	98:1	86
55:24	113	98:3	87
56:4	113	99:7	59
56:5	113	100:5	87
56:12	113	103:1	86
62:2	114	104:10-11	59
62:6	114	105:10	59
62:9	113	106:22	86
62:11	113	106:38	58
71:8	122	106:48	88
72:7	110	108:26	86
72:8	52	115:9	113
72:19	88	115:10	113
74:12	69	115:11	113
75:9	97	118:9	113
76:4	168	118:23	86
77:12	86	118:142	183
77:15	86	119:21	91
77:23	77	119:30	87
78:12	86	119:42	113
78:22	113	119:51	91
78:23	77	119:69	91
81:3	62	119:75	87
81:5	59	119:78	91
83:18	113	119:86	87
84:13	113	119:90	87
85:12	86	119:116	111
86:2	113	119:122	91
86:14	92	119:129	86
88:11	86	119:138	87
88:12	87	132:12	113
88:13	86	132:14	113
89:2	87	133:2	97
89:3	87	143:1	87
89:6	86, 87	143:8	113
89:9	87	144:14	65
89:25	87	148:6	59
89:34	87	149:3	62
89:50	87	150:4	62
89:53	88		
91:2	113	Proverbs	
92:3	87	2:8	112
92:8	113	2:20	110

4:13	112	2:12	116, 128
8:31	52	2:15	105
10:15	108	2:17	115
11:13	158, 159	2:19	71
11:21	110	2:21	71
11:30	110	3	9
13:3	112	3:1	51
13:6	112	3:4	17
18:11	108	3:10	110
18:18	62	3:12	17, 70
18:19	108	3:14	17
20:7	110	3:16	71, 128
21:24	133	3:17	53
24:18	78	3:24	58
24:20	164	3:26	57
27:9	97	4:2	16, 71, 113
28:7	112	4:3	61
30:21	58	5:1-7	109
		5:2	101
Song of Songs		5:4	101, 172
1:3	97	5:6	109
		5:7	101
Isaiah		5:8	69
1-27	51	5:9	53, 67
1-39	51, 74	5:11	7, 174
1-66	8	5:12	62, 97, 174
1:1	22	5:14	63, 128, 145
1:3	176	5:15	115-16
1:7	53, 90	5:16	154
1:8	80	5:19	86
1:10	123	5:23	110
1:11	123	5:25	66
1:12	117, 123	5:26	87
1:16	62	6:2	74
1:20	56, 101	6:10	61
1:21	65, 110	6:11	53, 67-68, 137
1:23	123	6:12	69, 113
1:25	153	7	16
1:29	64	7:4	100, 175
1:30	57	7:7	170
2:2	60	7:17	113
2:4	139	7:22	69
2:9	116	8:3	126
2:10	71	8:7	20
2:11	115	8:8	11, 20

<i>Isaiah (cont.)</i>		11:11	61
8:9	20	11:12	74, 147
8:10	78, 86	11:14	11, 55, 126
8:16	151	11:15	53
8:16-22	151	11:16	14, 61
8:17	101, 113	12	138
8:18	113, 186	12:2	14, 113-114
8:19	151	12:3	143
9:1	53	12:4	115, 157
9:2	110, 142	12:5	74, 157
9:3	142	12:6	53, 71-72
9:5	6, 36-38	13	123-25, 140, 161
9:6	38, 111, 123	13:2	70, 123-24
9:7	175	13:3	63
9:9	23	13:5	52, 122, 140
9:10	113	13:6	66
9:11	23	13:9	52, 67, 124, 145, 153
9:15	100	13:10	153
9:16	58	13:11	52, 71, 90-91, 116, 123, 161
9:19	60	13:12	16, 123
10:6	58	13:13	77
10:8	31	13:16	126
10:9	20, 30	13:20	53, 100, 161
10:10	20, 66, 123	14	16, 125
10:12	81, 172	14-16	47, 74, 144
10:13	53, 122, 126, 128	14:1	102
10:14	122-23, 128	14:2	113
10:17	16	14:3	102, 113
10:19	61	14:5	113
10:20	14, 19, 61, 110, 113, 144	14:11	71
10:21	61	14:14	17
10:22	14, 61, 144	14:15	17
10:23	52, 113	14:16	77, 128, 159
10:24	11, 21, 53, 122	14:17	52, 128
10:26	6, 113	14:18-20	11
10:27	52	14:19-20	
10:30	72	14:22	61, 159
10:31	53	14:22-27	20
10:33	51, 116, 128	14:23	124
11:1-5	147, 185	14:26	52, 86, 159
11:2	86, 113	14:27	78, 113
11:3	113	14:30	6
11:4	94, 147	14:31	66
11:5	87	14:32	94
11:10	16	15-16	178

15:1	103, 178-79	22:1	22
15:2	66, 103	22:3	87
15:3	66	22:5	11
15:4	60, 103	22:5-11	20
15:5	103	22:7	109
15:7-9	11	22:10	105
15:8	103	22:11	87, 105
15:9	109	22:13	172
16:3	94, 109	22:16	57
16:4	117	22:16-18	21
16:5	110	22:17	51
16:6	71	22:21	53
16:7	103	23	11, 21, 24-25, 35, 41, 63, 100
16:8	57	23:1	23, 66
16:10	62, 71, 142	23:2	53
16:14	61	23:4	64
17	123	23:6	53
17:3	61	23:7	63
17:4	126	23:8	123, 128
17:6	61, 69	23:9	128, 145
17:10	94, 114	23:10	23
18-23	9	23:12	19
18:1	74	23:13	154, 179
18:2	16	23:14	66, 93
18:7	16	23:17	52, 81, 100, 113, 175
19	16	23:18	53
19:3	122	24	15, 16, 17, 41, 47, 49, 53, 66, 74,
19:3	86		119, 121, 123, 125, 128-29, 133-
19:8	57, 61		34, 138-42, 144-45, 149, 151, 154,
19:11	86, 123		160, 190
19:13	6, 123	24-26	147, 160-61, 185
19:14	71, 80	24-27	3, 46-47, 51-52, 73, 76, 89-
19:16-25	20		90, 103, 108, 114, 121, 160-61, 183
19:17	86	24:1	52-53, 55, 59-60, 115, 121-
19:18	20-22		26, 128, 130, 133, 135, 137, 140,
19:24	69		155, 159-60, 190
19:24-25	14	24:1a	51, 128
20:5	11, 64	24:1c-d	125
20:6	16, 53	24:1-3	134, 152
21	16	24:1-4	150
21:2	75	24:1-12	137
21:3	19, 53, 125	24:1-13	145
21:4	7	24:1-23	x, 46, 51, 155-56
21:14	53	24:1-26:6	ix, x, 1, 2, 33, 35, 41, 43-
21:17	61		47, 49, 119, 183, 189-94

*Isaiah (cont.)*

24:2 54, 80, 121-22, 126, 128, 179  
 24:3 52, 55-56, 78, 101, 121-22,  
 126-28, 133, 150-51, 193  
 24:3a 126-28  
 24:3b 126-27  
 24:4 52, 56-57, 122-24, 126-28,  
 133-34, 140, 145, 153, 155-56,  
 159, 179, 187, 190  
 24:4a 127-28  
 24:4b 128  
 24:4c 127-28, 140  
 24:4-7 127  
 24:4-19 151  
 24:5 3, 52-53, 58-59, 115, 122, 127,  
 129-30, 132-33, 140, 147-49, 151,  
 155, 170, 179, 186, 190  
 24:5a 127, 129-31, 140, 145, 155  
 24:5b 129, 155  
 24:5c 130  
 24:5-6a 150-51  
 24:6 3, 16, 52, 53, 61, 67, 115, 122,  
 126-27, 131-33, 137, 140, 142,  
 145, 155-56, 170, 180, 190, 192  
 24:6a 127, 130-31, 149  
 24:6b 130-31  
 24:6c 127, 130, 155, 184, 191  
 24:6d 144  
 24:7 57, 62, 126-27, 131-34, 136,  
 170, 179  
 24:7-12 138  
 24:8 66, 129, 132-36, 138,  
 140-41, 145, 149, 155-56, 160-61,  
 170, 179-80, 190-92  
 24:8-11 138  
 24:8-12 132, 133, 141  
 24:9 2, 126, 133-36, 192  
 24:9-23 134  
 24:10 ix, 47, 53, 65, 124, 135-37, 140,  
 155-56, 161, 180, 189-91, 193-94  
 24:10a 135-36  
 24:10b 64  
 24:11 65-66, 135-36, 155, 185  
 24:11a 136  
 24:11b 136

24:12 ix, 47, 61, 67, 124, 135-38,  
 155-56, 161, 180, 189-91, 193-94  
 24:12a 136-37  
 24:12b 136-37  
 24:13 69, 137-42, 145, 155-56, 159,  
 176, 180, 190  
 24:13a 140-41  
 24:13c 139-41  
 24:13d 140  
 24:13-16 155  
 24:14 61, 71, 131, 140, 142-46,  
 155-56, 183, 185, 189-90  
 24:14a 141, 144-45, 149  
 24:14b 145  
 24:14c 144  
 24:14-16 47, 140, 155  
 24:15 143-47, 149, 176, 190  
 24:15a 144  
 24:15b 145  
 24:16 74-75, 129, 133, 143, 146-47,  
 149-51, 153, 155, 176, 188, 190-91  
 24:16a 74  
 24:17 53, 59, 76, 115, 123, 130,  
 149-50  
 24:17-20 149, 152  
 24:17-23 152  
 24:18 76-77, 82, 145, 150  
 24:18f 77  
 24:19 77-78, 126-27, 145, 150-51  
 24:20 129, 145, 149-51, 153, 155, 190  
 24:21 81-82, 113, 152, 139, 152-53,  
 156, 190  
 24:21-23 152, 155, 158  
 24:22 81, 152-54, 190  
 24:23 5, 84, 105, 145, 152, 154, 158,  
 161-62, 168, 171, 179-80, 183, 190  
 24:23a 5  
 24:23b 5, 84  
 25 49, 119, 157, 133, 157, 163, 170,  
 177, 190  
 25:1 74, 86-88, 132, 146, 154, 157-  
 59, 162, 175, 180  
 25:1a-b 158  
 25:1-b 160  
 25:1c 158



- 25:1-5 14-16, 33, 41, 46-47, 92, 133,  
 156-59, 168, 171, 180  
 25:1-5a 155  
 25:1-8 134  
 25:1-10 149  
 25:1-12 x, 85, 178-80  
 25:2 ix, 65, 90-91, 124, 129, 132,  
 135, 146, 154, 156, 159-63, 168, 175-  
 76, 180, 182-83, 187-91, 193-94  
 25:2a-b 161  
 25:2c 160  
 25:3 ix, 2, 65, 131, 133, 161-63,  
 165-66, 177, 179-80, 184, 189-90,  
 192, 194  
 25:3a 163  
 25:3b 163  
 25:3f 19  
 25:3-5a 156, 179, 191-92  
 25:4 ix, 90, 92, 133, 160, 162-  
 63, 165-66, 168, 171, 177, 179-80,  
 184, 189-90, 192, 194  
 25:4a 163  
 25:4d 163  
 25:5 x, 16, 49, 74, 90, 96, 131,  
 133-34, 140, 155, 159-60, 162,  
 165-66, 168-71, 175-77, 179-80,  
 182, 184-85, 190-91, 194  
 25:5-8 156  
 25:6 69, 97-98, 133-34, 169, 171-  
 72, 174, 176, 179-80, 182, 190  
 25:6a 171-72  
 25:6-8 140, 155, 158-59, 169-71,  
 176, 185  
 25:6-10 184  
 25:6-12 170  
 25:7 97, 133-34, 138, 159, 169, 171,  
 174-76, 179-80, 182, 185-86, 190  
 25:8 56, 100-101, 113,  
 133-34, 146, 155, 174-77, 179-80,  
 182, 184, 190-91  
 25:8a 174  
 25:8b 175  
 25:8c 175-76  
 25:9 101, 143, 156, 177, 179, 182,  
 184-86, 188, 191  
 25:10 102-3, 113, 146, 169, 177-80,  
 182, 184, 191  
 25:11 104, 116, 178-79, 191  
 25:12 115-16, 178-79, 191  
 26 133  
 26:1 ix, 64, 105, 108-9, 154, 161,  
 179-80, 182-91, 194  
 26:1a-b 181  
 26:1-3b 181  
 26:1c 182  
 26:1c-2 181  
 26:1c-3b 181  
 26:1-5 183, 187  
 26:1-6 x, 46, 49, 107, 119, 181, 185,  
 187-88, 191  
 26:1-8 112  
 26:2 110, 147, 154, 181, 183-85, 191,  
 194  
 26:3 16, 110-112, 147, 181, 183-85,  
 188, 191, 194  
 26:3c-6 184  
 26:3c-4a 181, 185-86  
 26:4 113, 156, 184-86, 188, 191  
 26:5 ix, 53, 57, 65, 115-16, 124, 128,  
 156, 161, 180, 182-83, 186-91, 193-  
 94  
 26:5-6 47  
 26:5a-b 186  
 26:6 94, 162  
 26:6-27:13 46  
 26:7 75, 147, 183, 185, 188, 191  
 26:8 101  
 26:9 53, 110, 115  
 26:10 145, 160, 180, 183  
 26:11 64  
 26:14 81  
 26:15 128, 145  
 26:18 53, 115  
 26:19 70-71, 160  
 26:21 51, 53, 81, 115  
 27 47  
 27:1 81, 113  
 27:3 46, 84, 154, 183  
 27:6 52  
 27:10 9

<i>Isaiah (cont.)</i>		32:1	123
27:12	16	32:2	96, 169
28	31	32:6	58
28:2	102	32:7	52
28:3	117	32:8	147
28:4	74, 100	32:9	63, 75
28:5	16, 61, 74	32:11	113
28:6-28	16	32:13	62, 63, 65
28:7	131	32:14	62, 65
28:8	131	32:15	57
28:12	102	32:16	53
28:17	60	32:17	113
28:20	99	32:18	16, 53, 63
28:22	159	33	30, 185
28:28	100	33:1	75, 148-49
28:29	123	33:2	101
29:1	65	33:2-6	186
29:4	116	33:5	57, 113, 186
29:5	63, 90, 134, 160	33:8	53, 62
29:6	77, 81, 83, 134	33:9	64
29:7	134	33:10	86
29:8	134	33:13	16
29:9	80	33:14	58, 185
29:11	56	33:17	16
29:15	86	33:18	6, 21-22, 27, 29-30, 52, 62
29:20	91	33:19	87
29:21	110	33:20	16, 63, 65, 100, 108, 182, 185
29:22	64	33:22	114, 185
30:1	86, 99	33:24	53
30:5	101	34	100
30:8	60	34:1	52
30:9	113	34:10	53
30:12	99	35	95, 169
30:13	84, 115, 182-83	35:1	96
30:18	113	35:2	143
30:20	60	35:4	168
30:26	84	36-39	166
30:29	114	36:1	182-83
30:30	113	36:4	113
30:32	102	36:5	113
31:1	113	36:6	113
31:3	153	36:7	113
31:9	149	36:9	113
31:9b-32:8	75, 147	36:15	113
32	147	36:18	113

36:20	113	42:11	53, 71
37:10	113	42:12	113
37:16	52	42:17	64, 99, 113, 129
37:18	53, 124	42:19	113
37:20	113	42:22	55
37:22	113	42:24	55, 113
37:23	70	42:25	62
37:26	182–83	43:4	123
37:32	14, 144	43:6	87
37:38	58	43:11	113
38:3	110	43:12	90
38:11	113	43:14	113
38:20	113	43:16	108
39:3	87	43:20	91
39:6	51, 113	43:25	100
39:9	97	44:5	113
40–66	4	44:6	113
40:2	22	44:7	22
40:4	116	44:8	114
40:5	4, 14, 39, 143	44:9	64
40:22	53	44:11	64
40:26	81	44:22	100, 126
40:27	113	44:23	14, 71, 113, 143
40:28	113	44:24	126
40:31	59, 101, 113, 130	44:25	78
41:1	16, 59, 130	44:26	53, 86
41:2	16	44:27	53
41:4	113	45:4	4
41:5	4, 16	45:7	138
41:6	4	45:8	143
41:9	111	45:11	22, 113
41:9a	16	45:12	153
41:11	64	45:13	4
41:14	113	45:16	16, 64, 143
41:15	103	45:17	16, 64
41:20	138	45:18	53
41:21	159	45:19	4
41:22	22	45:21	110, 113
41:25	117, 123	45:22	16
42:1	4, 111	45:24	16, 64
42:1–8	25	46:7	102
42:2	66	46:10	22, 86
42:3	110	46:11	4
42:5	113	46:12	87
42:10	53, 64, 157	47	161

<i>Isaiah (cont.)</i>		53:11	110
47:8	113	53:12	58
47:13	86, 159	53:13	58
48:1	110	54:1	71-72
48:8	75	54:3	53
48:15	4	54:4	101
48:16	4	54:6	168
48:20	16, 143	54:13	113
48:21	4	54:16	126
49:1	16	55:5	110
49:1-9a	25	55:6	113
49:2	94	55:7	159
49:5	108	55:8	159
49:6	16	55:12	143
49:7	123	56-66	32, 65
49:12	87	57:1	110
49:13	71, 113, 143	57:9	116
49:17	53	57:15	168, 186
49:19	53, 100	57:19	87
49:20	53	58:2	110
49:21	61	58:8	113
49:23	64, 116	58:9	113
49:25	91-92	58:11	113
49:26	111	58:13	113
50:4-11	25	58:14	56, 101
50:7	64	59	132
50:10	113	59:2	132
51:3	74, 143	59:3	132
51:5	4, 16, 101	59:4	87, 113, 132
51:6	53	59:6	132
51:9	108	59:9	101, 132
51:10	53	59:10	132
51:13	113	59:11	101, 132
51:15	60, 72, 144	59:12	132
51:18	111	59:14	87, 110
51:23	19, 66	59:15	110
52:1	108	59:16	111
52:2	116	60	184
52:5	66	60:1	182, 184
52:8	70-71, 143	60:1-7	14
52:9	143	60:2	184
52:10	4, 16	60:4	87
52:13-53:12	15, 25	60:5	110
53	9, 10	60:6	184
53:3	60	60:9	16, 87, 101

60:10	184	3:19	88
60:12	53	3:21	53
60:14	184	5:22	59
60:15	58, 62, 71, 143	6:5	89
60:17	58, 123	9:4	53
60:18	62, 182	9:8	110
60:21	110, 112, 182	11:5	88
61:2	57	13:25	113
61:3	57–58	14:2	65
61:5	90	15:18	100
61:9	113	15:21	92
61:10	143	19:7	52
62:5	142	20:11	92
62:8	108	22:26	99
62:11	16	25:21	103
63:3	116	27:11	53
63:5	111	30:16	55
63:6	116	31:4	62
63:14	103	31:12	71
63:18–19	170	31:24	53
64	170	31:31	66
64:5	57	31:33	103
64:6	111, 170	31:36	62
65:1	143	31:43	76
65:2	104	33:9	110
65:6	166	39:14	114
65:13	64	39:18	186
65:14	71, 143	39:19	114, 186
65:15	103	40:4	78
65:16	87	46:10	97
65:18	113	46:15	65
65:19	142	48:11	97
65:21	53	48:45	63
65:22	53	49:1	53
65:23	113, 166	51:2	52
65:25	19	51:23	130
66:1	102		
66:5	64	Lamentations	
66:6	62	1:8	61
66:19	87	1:21	61
		2:15	62
Jeremiah			
2:15	67	Ezekiel	
3:1	58	4:16	165
3:2	58	5:5	139

<i>Ezekiel (cont.)</i>		4:6	165
12:19	165	6:6	97-98, 172
20:25	59	9:14	4
20:41	110		
21:11	61	Obadiah	
21:12	61	15-16	174
25:13	69	16	174
28:7	92		
28:25	110	Jonah	
30:11	92	2:7	86
31:12	92		
32:12	92	Micah	
45:14	59	4:4	56
		5:3	71
Daniel		6:16	176
1:5	97	7:5	113
1:8	97	7:15	86
2:45	114, 186		
4:37	114, 186	Nahum	
7:25	131	2:3	52
9:4	114, 186	2:11	52
9:5	53		
11:24	183	Habakkuk	
11:32	58	1:12	114
12:6	86		
		Zephaniah	
Hosea		3:12	94, 117
2:13	62		
8:14	89	Zechariah	
10:13	113	9:9	117
		14:14	110
Joel			
1:10	132	Malachi	
2:17	176	2:6	183
2:26	86	3:10	77
		3:22	59
Amos		3:24	130
1:4	89		
1:7	89		
1:10	89		
1:12	89	Matthew	
1:14	89	26:29	174
2:2	89		
2:4	59, 130	Acts	
2:5	89	21:28	66

## NEW TESTAMENT

2 Corinthians		4QIsa <sup>c</sup>	52 n. 6, 53 n. 9, 56 n. 20, 57 n.
3:18	53, 125	23, 58 n. 27, 59, 60 n. 39, 66 n. 67, 67,	70 nn. 86–87, 72, 83 n. 145, 101 n. 78,
Titus		104 n. 89, 109, 110 n. 13, 112, 113, 145	
1:7	133	n. 72	
2 Peter		1QS	111
2:10	133		
		PHILO	
Revelation			
18:10	183	<i>De agricultura</i>	66 n. 65
		APOCRYPHA AND SEPTUAGINT	
		<i>De migrationi Abrahami</i>	66 n. 65
Baruch	74 n. 105, 130 n. 34	<i>De somniis</i>	66 n. 65
1–2 Esdras	122 n. 4	<i>De specialibus legibus</i>	98 n. 65
Judith	74 n. 105, 98, 165, 168, 172	TARGUMIC TEXTS	
1–2 Maccabees	66 n. 65, 130 n. 34, 131, 142, 183	Targum Isaiah 19, 52 nn. 6 and 8, 53 n. 9, 55 n. 13, 55 n. 15, 56 n. 20, 57 n. 23, 58 n. 27, 58 n. 32, 59, 60 nn. 39–40, 62 n. 46, 64 n. 56, 65 n. 58, 66 n. 67, 67 nn. 70–71, 73 n. 102, 81 n. 137, 82 n. 141, 86 n. 5, 89, 90 n. 24, 98 n. 67, 101 n. 78, 107 n. 1, 109, 109 n. 11, 110 n. 13, 111 n. 23, 112, 112 n. 25, 113, 116 n. 41, 117 n. 49, 174, 174 n. 47	
Sirach	142, 147, 165, 168, 172		
Tobit	53 n. 10, 86, 125, 130 n. 34		
Wisdom	60 n. 39, 66 n. 65		
		DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND RELATED TEXTS	
		APOSTOLIC FATHERS	
1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	15, 19, 21 n. 105, 52 n. 6, 53 n. 9, 54 n. 13, 56 n. 20, 57 n. 23, 57 n. 26, 58 n. 27, 59, 60 nn. 38–40, 66 n. 67, 67 nn. 70–71, 70 nn. 86–87, 73 n. 102, 82 n. 141, 83 n. 145, 85 n. 1, 89, 90 n. 24, 101 n. 78, 103, 104 n. 89, 107 n. 1, 109, 110 n. 13, 112, 116 n. 41, 117, 117 n. 49	1–2 Clement	66 n. 65
1QIsa <sup>b</sup>	19, 78 n. 124, 107 n. 1, 112		
4QIsa <sup>b</sup>	21 n. 105		

## INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- |                               |   |  |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| Aejmelaesus, Anneli           | 34 n. 170, 36 n. 177, 37, 37 n. 183, 37 n. 184, 38, 43 n. 209, 194 n. 1   | n. 34, 93 n. 36, 94 n. 37, 94 n. 39, 94 n. 41, 94 n. 43, 94 nn. 45–46, 157 n. 2, 159 n. 5, 160 n. 6, 161 n. 12, 161 n. 14, 163, 163 n.15, 164, 164 n.18, 164 n. 21, 164 n. 23, 165, 166 n. 25, 168 n. 30   |
| Baer, David A.                | 22 n. 111, 32 n. 164, 65 n. 62, 185 n. 7  |  |
| Barr, James                   | 32, 32 n. 163, 35 n. 174, 41 n. 19  | Crom, Dries de 43, 43 n. 211   |
| Barthélemy, Dominique         | xiv   | Cunha, Wilson de Angelo 47 n 220, 74 n. 111, 144 n. 68   |
| Baumgartner, Walter           | xiv   | Doyle, Brian 47 n. 219   |
| Blenkinsopp, Joseph           | 74 n. 106   | Driver, S. R. xiii   |
| Bosman, Hendrick J.           | 46 n. 217, 51 n. 1, 73 n. 103, 76 n. 118, 89 n. 16, 90 n. 20, 108 n. 4, 114 n. 35, 160 n. 7   | Ekblad, Eugene R., Jr. 25, 26, 26 n. 130   |
| Boyd-Taylor, Cameron          | 34 n. 170, 37 n. 184, 194 n. 1  | Euler, Karl F. 9, 10, 10 n. 38, 15 n. 69   |
| Brenton, Lancelot Charles Lee | xiv, 129, 132 n. 37, 136, 136 n. 43, 138, 139, 140 n. 52, 148, 154, 157 n. 2, 161 n. 11, 165, 167, 170 n. 39, 172, 172 n. 43, 173, 174, 174 n. 49, 178, 178 n. 60, 181            | Fischer, Johann 5, 5 n. 19, 6, 6 n. 23, 7, 7 nn. 26–27, 8 n. 32, 30 n. 153, 53 n. 9, 67 n. 71, 67 n. 73, 68 n. 76, 68 n. 78, 69 n. 79, 71 n. 95, 74 n. 108, 74 n. 112, 89 n. 17, 90 n. 23, 90 n. 25, 91 n. 27, 93, 93 n. 35, 94 n. 46, 95 n. 48, 99 n. 69, 100 n. 75, 104 n. 90, 111, 111 n. 18, 111 n. 22 |
| Brockington, Leonard H.       | 14, 14 n. 64, 75 n. 12, 144 n. 69   | Fritsch, Charles T. 102, 102 n. 83, 114 n. 36  |
| Briggs, Charles A.            | xiii  | Gesenius, Wilhelm xiv  |
| Brown, Francis                | xiii  | Gray, George B. 51 n. 1  |
| Burrows, Millar               | 85 n. 1   | Grol, Harm W. M. van 51 n. 1, 73 n. 103, 76 n. 118, 89 n. 16, 90 n. 20, 108 n. 4, 114 n. 35, 160 n. 7  |
| Casevitz, Michel              | 130 n. 31   | Hanhart, Robert 11 n. 41, 38 n. 186  |
| Childs, Brevard S.            | 46 n. 216   | Hatch, Edwin xiv   |
| Chilton, Bruce D.             | 53 n. 9, 174 n. 47  | Hauspie, K. xv   |
| Conybeare, F. C.              | 121 n. 2, 146 n. 73   | Hibbard, Todd J. 47 n. 219   |
| Coste, Jean M.                | 14, 14 n. 67, 15, 15 n. 70, 33, 33 n. 167, 41, 41 n. 200, 47, 86 n. 4, 87 n. 6, 87 nn. 9–10, 88 n. 12, 89 n. 17, 89 n. 19, 90 n. 23, 90 n. 25, 91 n. 27, 92, 92 nn. 29–31, 93, 93 | Hieke, Thomas 100 n. 71, 175 n. 50   |
|                               |   | Jastrow, Marcus 93 n. 35   |
|                               |   | Jobes, Karen H. 10 n. 40   |
|                               |   | Jones, Henry Stuart xv   |



- Joüon, Paul xv, 54 n. 11, 66 n. 63, 78 n. 125, 101 nn. 78–79
- Katz, Peter 2 n. 4
- Koehler, Ludwig xiv
- Koenig, Jean 4 n. 14, 22, 23, 23 n. 116, 24, 30 n. 153, 96 n. 51, 169 n. 34, 193
- Kooij, Arie van der x, 7 n. 26, 9 n. 37, 19, 20, 20 n. 100, 20 nn. 104–5, 21, 21 n. 106, 21 n. 110, 22, 22 n. 111, 22 n. 112, 22 nn. 114–15, 24, 24 nn. 124–26, 25, 25 n. 128, 28, 29, 30, 30 n. 151, 31, 31 n. 157, 31 n. 160, 35, 35 n. 173, 38 n. 186, 41, 41 n. 203, 43 nn. 208–9, 44, 46 n. 217, 47 n. 218, 60 n. 39, 63 n. 51, 71 n. 96, 73 n. 102, 73 n. 104, 75 n. 114, 87 n. 7, 89 n. 16, 90 nn. 20–22, 90 n. 26, 95 n. 50, 96 n. 55, 100 n. 76, 103 n. 85, 107 n. 1, 108, 108 n. 4, 108 n. 7, 112 n. 29, 114 n. 35, 128 n. 25, 147 n. 77, 148 n. 78, 154, 154 n. 93, 158 n. 4, 159 n. 5, 160 n. 7, 161 n. 8, 161 n. 14, 169 n. 33, 170 n. 36, 174 n. 48, 175 n. 52, 178 n. 58, 182 n. 4, 193, 194
- Kutscher, Edward Y. 85 n. 1
- Le Moigne, Phillippe. xi, 129 n. 26, 141 n. 53
- Liddell, Henry George xv
- Liebmann, Ernst 2, 3, 3 n. 5, 3 n. 8, 7, 52 n. 7, 53 n. 10, 54 n. 12, 56 nn. 18–19, 57 n. 22, 56 n. 32, 60, 60 n. 40, 62 n. 47, 63 n. 53, 64 nn. 55–56, 64 n. 58, 65 n. 62, 66 nn. 66–67, 67 n. 72, 68 nn. 75–77, 69 n. 79, 71 n. 89, 72 n. 97, 73 n. 101, 74 n. 107, 75 n. 116, 77, 77 n. 119, 77 n. 122, 79 nn. 131–32, 80 n. 134, 81 n. 136, 81 nn. 139–40, 82 n. 142, 83 n. 144, 83 nn. 147–48, 84 n. 150, 84 n. 152, 87 n. 10, 89 n. 17, 89 n. 19, 90 n. 21, 90 n. 23, 93, 93 n. 33, 94 n. 39, 97, 97 n. 62, 98 n. 66, 99 n. 68, 100 n. 73, 102 n. 80, 103 n. 84, 104 nn. 89–90, 108, 108 n. 3, 108 n. 6, 110 n. 13, 111, 111 n. 19, 111 n. 21, 112, 112 n. 24, 112 n. 26, 115 n. 37, 116 n. 41, 116 n. 43, 116 n. 45, 117, 117 n. 47, 117 n. 50, 125 n. 16, 126 n. 18, 126 n. 21, 130 n. 33, 131 n. 35, 133 n. 38, 150 n. 85, 160 n. 7, 161 n. 13, 172 n. 45
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh 186 n. 10
- Louw, Theo A. W. 35 n. 174
- Lust, Johan xv
- McKenzie, Roderick xv
- Meer, Michaël N. van der x, 9 n. 37, 75 n. 114, 87 n. 7, 103 n. 85, 147 n. 77, 148 nn. 78–79, 159 n. 4, 178 n. 57
- Menxel, François van 74 n. 109, 147 n. 76, 161 n. 9, 183 n. 5, 185 n. 8
- Milligan, George xv
- Moulton, James Hope xv
- Muraoka, Takamitsux, xiv, xv, 52 n. 4, 97 nn. 60–61, 100 n. 77, 109 n. 11, 110 n. 17, 139, 140, 148,
- Nauck, August 186 n. 10
- Neves, J. C. M. das 15, 15 n. 73, 16, 16 nn. 77–79, 17, 17 nn. 81–83, 41, 41 n. 203, 52 n. 3, 52 n. 4, 58 nn. 29–30, 61 n. 42, 62 n. 48, 63 nn. 53–54, 64 n. 55, 64 n. 58, 65 n. 60, 69 n. 80, 71 n. 88, 71 n. 93, 71 n. 95, 72 n. 98, 72 n. 100, 74 n. 110, 75 nn. 115–16, 76 n. 117, 77, 77 n. 119, 77 n. 121, 77 n. 123, 78 n. 127, 78 n. 129, 79 n. 132, 80 n. 135, 81 n. 138, 82 nn. 142–43, 83 n. 144, 83 n. 146, 84 n. 150, 87 n. 10, 89 n. 19, 92, 92 n. 31, 93 n. 34, 93 n. 36, 122 n. 3, 123, 123 n. 7, 124, 125, 125 n. 17, 128, 128 n. 24, 129, 129 n. 28, 130 n. 33, 132 n. 37, 133, 133 n. 40, 135, 136, 136 n. 43, 138, 138 n. 47, 139, 139 n. 49, 139 n. 51, 141 nn. 53–54, 141 n. 56, 142, 142 n. 58, 142 n. 61, 144 n. 67, 146, 146 n. 74, 147, 150 n. 85, 152 n. 87, 153, 153 n. 89, 153 n. 91, 157 n. 2, 159 n. 5, 161 n. 10, 163, 163 n. 15, 164, 164 n. 22, 165, 166 n. 25, 193
- Ngunga, Abi T. 36 n. 85, 169 n. 34, 177 n. 56
- O'Connor, Michael xiv
- Olley, John W. 18, 18 n. 87, 19, 43 n. 210, 163 n. 17

- Oswalt, John N. 51 n. 1
- Ottley, Richard R. 4, 4 n. 15, 5, 5 n. 18, 53 n. 9, 55, 55 n. 14, 58 n. 30, 60 n. 41, 61 n. 43, 62 n. 48, 64 n. 55 and 58, 65 n. 60, 66 n. 68, 67 n. 73, 68 nn. 76 and 78, 69 n. 79, 81, and 83, 71 n. 95, 72 n. 99, 74 nn. 107 and 112, 77 n. 122, 78 n. 126, 81 n. 140, 84 nn. 149-51, 89 n. 18, 91 n. 27, 92 n. 30, 93, 93 n. 34, 94 nn. 38, 43, and 45, 96 n. 52, 97, 97 n. 58, 98 n. 63, 100, 100 n. 72, 104 n. 90, 108 n. 2, 110 n. 14, 111, 111 n. 18, 113, 113 n. 31, 114, 114 n. 36, 116 n. 40, 129, 132 n. 37, 136, 136 n. 43, 138, 139, 140 n. 52, 142 n. 57, 148, 149 n. 81, 150 n. 83, 154, 157 n. 2, 161 n. 11, 163, 163 n. 16, 165, 166, 166 n. 25, 166 n. 28, 67, 170 n. 39, 172, 172 n. 43, 173, 174, 174 n. 49, 175 n. 51, 178, 178 n. 61, 193
- Parry, Donald W. xiv, 57 n. 26, 70 n. 86
- Payne Smith, Jessie 52 n. 8
- Pearson, Brook W. R. 46 n. 215
- Pietersma, Albert xv, 29, 29 n. 145, 30
- Porter, Stanley E. 46 n. 215
- Preisigke, Friedrich 133 n. 39, 149 n. 82
- Rahlfs, Alfred 100, 100 nn. 73-74, 165, 170 n. 38, 171
- Raurell, Frederic 17 n. 80, 17 nn. 83-84, 18 n. 86, 140 n. 52, 144 n. 69, 145 n. 71
- Redpath, Henry A. xiv
- Rudolph, Wilhelm 74 n. 113
- Schaper, Joachim L. 30 n. 150
- Scholl, Reinhard 47 n. 219
- Scholz, Anton 1, 2, 53 n. 9, 56 n. 17, 64 n. 55, 67 n. 71, 69 n. 79, 78 n. 128, 83 n. 148, 91 n. 127, 97 n. 57, 192, 193
- Scott, Robert xv
- Seeligmann, Isac Leo 10, 11, 11 n. 41, 11 n. 44, 12, 12 n. 47, 13, 13 nn. 54-60, 14, 21 n. 105, 30 n. 150, 36 n. 176, 37 n. 182, 38, 39, 39 n. 187, 40, 40 n. 197, 41, 55 n. 16, 88, 88 n. 13, 89 n. 19, 96 n. 54, 122, 122 nn. 4-5, 123, 130 n. 33, 144, 144 nn. 69-70, 158 n. 4, 170 n. 37, 173, 173 n. 46, 193, 194, 194 n. 2
- Sheppard, Herbert W. 2 n. 4
- Silva, Moisés 10 n. 40
- Smyth, Herbert W. 130 n. 30
- Sokoloff, Michael 109 n. 11
- Sperber, Alexander 53 n. 9
- Spicq, Ceslas xvi
- Stamm, Jakob Johann xiv
- Stock, George 121 n. 2, 146 n. 73
- Swete, Henry B. 3 n. 7, 165
- Qimron, Elisha 57 n. 26, 70 n. 86
- Talmon, Shemaryahu 87, 87 n. 8, 88, 88 n. 11, 88 n. 14
- Thackeray, Henry St. John 55 n. 16
- Toury, Gideon 33, 33 nn. 168-69, 40, 42, 42 n. 207, 44, 44 n. 214, 143 n. 66
- Tov, Emanuel xiv, 35 n. 174, 103 n. 85, 111 n. 17, 178 n. 57, 195 n. 3
- Troxel, Ronald L. 17-18 n. 85, 21 n. 105, 22 n. 111 and 114, 26, 26 n. 132, 27, 28, 29, 30, 30 n. 150, 31, 31 nn. 156-57 and 160, 32 n. 164, 36 n. 176, 38 n. 185, 39, 39 n. 189, 40, 41 n. 204, 42, 43, 43 n. 208, 69 n. 85, 86 n. 3, 87 n. 7, 90 n. 21, 91 n. 27, 92 n. 31, 93 n. 36, 94 nn. 37-38 and 41-42, 96 n. 51, 97 n. 59, 99 n. 70, 159 n. 4, 168 n. 32, 193
- Ulrich, Eugene 57 n. 26
- Vaccari, Alberto 2 n. 4, 21 n. 105
- Vorm-Croughs, Mirjam van der xi, 8 n. 32, 57 n. 24, 63 n. 49, 66 n. 68, 77 n. 120, 80 n. 133, 94 n. 38, 98 n. 66, 108 n. 2, 112 n. 28, 116 n. 42, 117 n. 48, 127 n. 22, 181 n. 2, 193
- Waard, Jan de. 78 n. 128, 79 n. 130
- Waltke, Bruce K. xiv
- Wevers, John Williams 139 n. 50
- Wildberger, Hans 74 n. 106
- Williams, Ronald J. 57 n. 25, 64 n. 57, 139 n. 50
- Wilson, Nigel G. 186 n. 10
- Ziegler, Joseph J. 4, 7, 7 nn. 28-30, 8, 8 n. 33, 9, 22, 30, 30 n. 153, 32, 33 n. 165, 49 n. 221, 56 n. 18, 63 n. 50, 66 n. 68, 68 nn. 75-76, 68 n. 78, 69 n. 84, 71

- n. 90, 71 n. 92, 90 n. 23, 92 n. 32, 94,  
94 nn. 40–41, 94 n. 45, 95 n. 49, 96, 96  
nn. 52–54, 98, 98 n. 64, 102, 102 n. 81,  
103, 103 n. 86, 105, 105 n. 91, 108 n. 2,  
109 nn. 8–9, 112, 112 n. 27, 116 n. 42,  
117 n. 46, 117 n. 50, 136 n. 44, 138 n.  
46, 141 n. 55, 142 n. 58, 148, 148 n. 78,  
149, 149 n. 82, 153, 153 n. 90, 165 n.  
24, 166, 166 n. 26, 166 n. 29, 169, 169  
n. 35, 170 n. 38, 171, 171 n. 41, 173,  
174, 174 n. 48, 181 n. 2  
Zillessen, Alfred 4, 4 n. 10, 22, 30 n. 153

